

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 31, 1987

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we gather during this historic time, O God, we ask Your blessing upon us. Aware of the noble traditions of our land and the history of our Congress, we come together in grateful appreciation celebrating the values of liberty and freedom which are the marks of our heritage. Make us aware, O God, of the gifts we have received and the opportunities before us. Bless our good land, bless our people, bless our institutions that we may be worthy of the high calling that is ours. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 317, nays 76, answered "present" 3, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

## YEAS—317

Ackerman	Berman	Bryant
Akaka	Bevill	Buechner
Alexander	Biaggi	Bustamante
Anderson	Bilbray	Byron
Andrews	Bilirakis	Callahan
Anthony	Boggs	Campbell
Applegate	Boland	Cardin
Archer	Boner (TN)	Carper
Aspin	Bonior (MI)	Carr
Atkins	Bonker	Chapman
AuCoin	Borski	Chappell
Ballenger	Bosco	Clarke
Barnard	Boucher	Clinger
Bartlett	Boxer	Coats
Bateman	Brennan	Coelho
Bates	Brooks	Coleman (TX)
Beilenson	Broomfield	Collins
Bennett	Brown (CA)	Combest
Bereuter	Bruce	Conte

Conyers	Johnson (CT)	Price (NC)
Cooper	Johnson (SD)	Pursell
Coyne	Jones (NC)	Quillen
Crockett	Jones (TN)	Rangel
Darden	Jontz	Ravenel
Daub	Kanjorski	Ray
Davis (MI)	Kaptur	Regula
de la Garza	Kasich	Rhodes
DeFazio	Kastenmeyer	Richardson
Dellums	Kennedy	Rinaldo
Derrick	Kildee	Ritter
DeWine	Klecza	Robinson
Dicks	Koiter	Rodino
Dingell	Kostmayer	Roe
Dixon	LaFalce	Rogers
Donnelly	Lagomarsino	Rose
Dorgan (ND)	Lancaster	Rowland (CT)
Downey	Lantos	Rowland (GA)
Duncan	Latta	Roybal
Durbin	Leath (TX)	Russo
Dwyer	Lehman (CA)	Sabo
Dymally	Lehman (FL)	Saiki
Dyson	Leland	Savage
Early	Lent	Saxton
Edwards (CA)	Levin (MI)	Scheuer
English	Levine (CA)	Schneider
Erdreich	Lewis (GA)	Schuette
Espy	Lightfoot	Schulze
Evans	Lipinski	Schumer
Fascell	Lowry (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Fawell	Lujan	Sharp
Fazio	Luken, Thomas	Shaw
Fish	Manton	Shumway
Flake	Markey	Shuster
Flippo	Martinez	Slisisky
Florio	Matsui	Skaggs
Foglietta	Mavroules	Skelton
Foley	Mazzoli	Slaughter (NY)
Ford (MI)	McCloskey	Slaughter (VA)
Ford (TN)	McCollum	Smith (FL)
Frank	McCurdy	Smith (IA)
Frost	McDade	Smith (NE)
Gallegly	McEwen	Smith (NJ)
Gallo	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Gaydos	McKinney	Snowe
Gejdenson	McMillan (NC)	Solarz
Gibbons	McMillen (MD)	Spratt
Gilman	Meyers	St Germain
Glickman	Mfume	Staggers
Gonzalez	Mica	Stallings
Gordon	Miller (WA)	Stark
Gradison	Mineta	Stenholm
Grandy	Moakley	Stokes
Grant	Mollohan	Stratton
Gray (IL)	Montgomery	Studds
Green	Moody	Sweeney
Guarini	Morella	Synar
Gunderson	Morrison (WA)	Tallon
Hall (OH)	Mrazek	Taylor
Hall (TX)	Murphy	Thomas (GA)
Hamilton	Murtha	Torres
Hammerschmidt	Myers	Torricelli
Harris	Nagle	Trafficant
Hastert	Natcher	Udall
Hatcher	Neal	Upton
Hawkins	Nelson	Valentine
Hayes (IL)	Nichols	Vento
Hayes (LA)	Nielson	Visclosky
Hefley	Nowak	Volkmer
Hefner	Oakar	Walgren
Herger	Oberstar	Watkins
Hertel	Olin	Waxman
Hiler	Ortiz	Weiss
Hochbrueckner	Owens (UT)	Weldon
Holloway	Oxley	Wheat
Horton	Packard	Whitten
Houghton	Panetta	Williams
Howard	Parris	Wilson
Hoyer	Pashayan	Wise
Hubbard	Patterson	Wolpe
Huckaby	Pease	Wortley
Hughes	Pepper	Wyden
Hunter	Perkins	Wyllie
Hutto	Petri	Yates
Hyde	Pickett	Yatron
Ireland	Pickle	Young (FL)
Jeffords	Price (IL)	

## NAYS—76

Armey	Goodling	Roemer
Badham	Gregg	Roth
Barton	Hansen	Roukema
Bentley	Henry	Schaefer
Billie	Hopkins	Schroeder
Boehlt	Inhofe	Sikorski
Boulter	Jacobs	Skeen
Brown (CO)	Kolbe	Smith, Denny
Bunning	Konnyu	(OR)
Burton	Kyl	Smith, Robert
Chandler	Leach (IA)	(NH)
Cheney	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Robert
Clay	Lewis (FL)	(OR)
Coble	Lloyd	Solomon
Coleman (MO)	Lott	Stangeland
Courter	Lukens, Donald	Stump
Craig	Lungren	Sundquist
Crane	Mack	Swindall
Davis (IL)	Madigan	Tauke
DeLay	Martin (IL)	Thomas (CA)
Dickinson	Martin (NY)	Vucanovich
DioGuardi	McCandless	Walker
Dorman (CA)	Miller (OH)	Weber
Dreier	Molinar	Wolf
Emerson	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Frenzel	Penny	
Gekas	Roberts	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Livingston	Obey	Whittaker
------------	------	-----------

## NOT VOTING—37

Annunzio	Gray (PA)	Rahall
Baker	Jenkins	Ridge
Coughlin	Kemp	Rostenkowski
Daniel	Kennelly	Sawyer
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Slatery
Dowdy	MacKay	Spence
Eckart	Marlenee	Swift
Edwards (OK)	McGrath	Tauzin
Feighan	Michel	Towns
Fields	Miller (CA)	Traxler
Garcia	Morrison (CT)	Vander Jagt
Gephardt	Owens (NY)	
Gingrich	Porter	

□ 1220

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce, for the interest of the Members, what our expectation is for our schedule today.

It is the intention of the Chair that we shall take 1-minute speeches and unanimous-consent requests and, when that has been done, that we shall proceed immediately to the vote to override the President's veto of the highway bill.

## MEMBERS URGED TO VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO OF THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I have been working on this highway bill legislation for over 2 years. While I agree that this is not a perfect bill, I believe it effectively addresses the critical transportation infrastructure problems our Nation faces.

This legislation has passed through a long and arduous process and I do not believe that a better bill can realistically be put together if we fail to override the President's veto. Without H.R. 2, the 1987 construction season will be lost and numerous projects will be brought to a halt. I believe this bill serves the best interest of the Nation.

I have the highest regard for President Reagan and my voting record clearly shows that I have been one of his strongest supporters in the House. But, on this issue I have to disagree with him. I will vote to override his veto of H.R. 2 and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

#### A NEW NAME FOR THE HIGHWAY BILL: THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVE (STI)

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress went wrong when we called this a highway bill that continued our commitment to highways. Perhaps we should have modeled it after something the President likes—like SDI, the strategic defense initiative. So let us not call it a highway bill today. Today we support our own STI, the surface transportation initiative. Now, it is not like its SDI namesake. The STI is not a budget buster. It spends \$1 billion less in 1987 than in 1986. Nor can it bust any budgets since all highway funds come from a dedicated trust fund.

The STI protects our domestic security. If this bill does not pass, my State loses \$100 million this year in highway funding, help in redesigning the Chelyan Bridge and rebuilding the West Virginia Turnpike. We cannot afford to lose this construction season.

So I ask the Members today to override the veto and vote for STI. Tell the President to stop the debate and begin to deploy, deploy those bulldozers and graders, deploy the bridge repairs, deploy the new concrete and highways, and deploy the 800,000 jobs that will be created.

Deploy, Mr. Speaker. Today we stand tall for STI.

#### THE TREATY OF ROME

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, March 25, marked the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, which unified the nations of Europe in the aftermath of World War II, and led to the establishment of the European Community.

It is the Treaty of Rome, and the subsequent formation of the 12-nation European Community which is generally credited with reducing historical tensions and rivalries in Europe, promoting economic recovery and security among member nations, and fostering a healthy relationship with the United States.

Evidence of that healthy relationship exists in the twice annual meetings which are held between members of the European Community and the Congress of the United States. Next month, I will join a number of my colleagues in attending one of these meetings, in Europe, to discuss matters of mutual interest, such as existing trade agreements, steel quotas, and the health of the alliance.

House Resolution 121, recently introduced, recognizes the great significance of the Treaty of Rome and commends the European Community's positive role in promoting growth, development and prosperity in Europe, and a close and mutually beneficial relationship with the United States, and I urge its adoption.

#### THE HIGHWAY BILL—A BUILDER, NOT A BUDGET BUSTER

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the President says he vetoed the highway bill because it is a budget buster. Well, he is wrong. This bill does not bust; it builds. It helps build our highways, it helps repair our bridges, and it invests in America.

And how do we pay for it? We pay for it with an excise tax, an excise tax that we enacted and that goes into a trust fund that can be used only for this purpose. That is a fact.

□ 1230

The President, with this veto, would have us believe he is against spending; that he is a tiger against spending. That is not so. The fact is, if it explodes, this fellow says, "Let's build it." If it is sent overseas, he says, "Let's spend it." The sky is the limit as far as that spending is concerned. It is just investing here in America that he has a problem with.

We have got contractors ready; we have got workers ready; we have got roads and bridges that need repair. We have got a short construction season in the northern reaches of this coun-

try. Now it is time for us in Congress to decide that we are going to override this veto and get about the business of investing in America.

#### HATS OFF TO THE IU HOOSIERS

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, does life imitate art or does art imitate life? Sometimes, it is hard to tell.

Now playing at your local theaters to rave reviews and overflow crowds, the movie "Hoosiers" depicts the miraculous last second victory of Hickory High in the Indiana high school basketball finals. That story is based on the real life story of little Milan High School's legendary victory 35 years ago.

Last night, in New Orleans, Coach Bobby Knight's IU Hoosiers attained the most coveted crown in college sports, the National NCAA Basketball Championship. Hats off to Coach Knight; hats off to Keith Smart, the game MVP; hats off to Steve Alford, MVP for the whole year; hats off to the entire IU team for a victory well-deserved, well-won, and well-coached.

Mr. Speaker, although I am still trying to figure out what the word "Hoosier" means, I am mighty proud to be one.

#### MEMBERS URGED TO OVERRIDE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

(Mr. ANDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge all our colleagues, from both parties, to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2, our vitally needed highway/transit legislation.

H.R. 2 passed the House in January on a vote of 401 to 20. In the ensuing conference, we pared that bill back. It became a more modest piece of legislation. Spending was cut back for both highways and mass transit. Funding for demonstration projects was substantially reduced. I suppose it was in recognition of this fact that we gained a few votes on the floor when we brought the conference report before the House, prevailing on a vote of 407 to 17.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask this question: If this bill was so good 13 days ago that it passed on its merits by a margin of 390 votes, why would it not pass today by a similar margin? How could it be explained that this was a good bill 13 days ago, one deserving to become law, but that today it is not.

This was a good bill 13 days ago when it passed in this Chamber by an



overwhelming vote, and it is a good bill today.

We are a part of the legislative branch of Government. It is our job to pass good laws. That is our job and our sworn responsibility. I am confident that our colleagues will accept this as their paramount responsibility and duty and will vote, as most did 13 days ago, to pass this good bill.

#### LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO REDUCE WELFARE DEPENDENCY

(Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that strikes at the heart of a problem that we are all concerned with: welfare dependency.

This legislation carries the name "greater opportunities through work," or better known as GROW. That is exactly what it is designed to do: to permit recipients of aid to families with dependent children to grow and become self-sufficient.

GROW is clearly superior to all the other welfare work proposals circulating. It is based on both research and experience; not rhetoric and empty promises. It targets its resources at that group most likely to be long-term welfare dependents: Teenage parents and young adults with children.

Let me make it clear that GROW is compassionate. It requires that able-bodied AFDC recipients participate in work-related activities aimed at increasing their employability, but it exempts those people who realistically cannot work. It provides training and education for those who need it. GROW also provides the necessary support services such as child care and transportation.

Rather than increasing incentives to stay on welfare, let us increase incentives to work. We need more opportunity, not more welfare checks, and this legislation will accomplish those goals.

#### LET US OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Speaker, the President said that all that highway pork is giving him heartburn. Let us analyze his heartburn. He wants more money for star wars, but he cuts back the war on drugs. He wants more money for the Contras, but he cuts back education money. He wants more missiles but not clean water. He wants more foreign aid, but he cuts retirement programs. Finally, he even talks about wanting an "Orient Express," but not safe highways.

Are these really symptoms of heartburn or of confused priorities. So, Mr. President, today Congress is saying in giving you the following prescription: Take two aspirin, a chug of Maalox and some milk of magnesia, and four Roloids because all that congressional relief is going to be spelled o-v-e-r-r-i-d-e.

To be quite honest, Mr. President, we are not really concerned today about your heartburn, we are concerned about the pain you are causing the American people.

Let us put Americans back to work and let us bring forward a good highway bill today. Let us override that veto.

#### BENTLEY APPLAUDS REAGAN SANCTIONS AGAINST JAPAN

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years, I have spoken from this lectern many times on the unfair trade practices of our allies—especially Japan's.

The Japanese, while flooding United States markets, have erected many direct, and indirect, barriers to American products. Agreement after agreement has been broken—including the microchip agreement of last summer.

With Japanese intransigence, the President had no choice but to apply sanctions. And, he is to be commended for his action.

But more needs to be done. The unemployed in the textile, tobacco, and automobile industries need help also. That \$50 billion trade deficit with Japan isn't in oil—it's in American manufacturing jobs. And, we cannot continue to pump that kind of money overseas without having it come back to buy American farmland, buildings, companies, and banks. They could own us.

There is no question that there are ample safeguards now on the books for the President to protect American workers. The problem is that the actions are discretionary with the President, and our military allies can pressure concessions on the economic front.

We need mandatory sanctions against trading partners who take advantage of our open markets while closing theirs.

Just like any person who must consider the consequences of breaking the law, these trading partners need to know they must balance putting Americans unfairly out of work against certain, swift penalties.

Mr. President, please continue to stand tall on this issue.

#### ROTTEN PORK

(Mr. AuCOIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, it's been said that the vote to override the veto on the surface transportation bill will show whether or not the President is back.

Well, that's not right. We're here to show whether or not the economy is back, freed from legislative deadlock, and with a green light for the creation of another 800,000 jobs.

Right now, 40 million dollars' worth of projects in my State are already jeopardized. If we fail to override this veto, another \$67 million will immediately be in peril. Every delay means a slow down in business development. Every delay means that ultimately these projects will cost even more, because the cost of construction is soaring.

Mr. Speaker, the President says this bill is "pork." Well, once again, he's wrong. Last Sunday I saw the Vice President of Honduras tell Mike Wallace on "60 Minutes" that the \$105 million Ronald Reagan wants to spend on the Contras is a "waste of time and money." You want pork, Mr. President? There's your pork, rotten pork. Stop that boondoggle, Mr. President, and leave America's highways alone.

#### WE MUST ACT ON ENERGY SECURITY BEFORE DISASTER STRIKES

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker ever since 1973, our country's energy security has been subject to the whims of the OPEC nations.

When the cartel's greed forced the price of oil upward in 1979, producers with high finding costs—like the United States—could finally compete again in the world market. That was a mistake on OPEC's part.

Now they've corrected that mistake—by driving prices down to a level below our production costs and pushing up U.S. energy consumption. Their plan to recapture the world market has worked.

The artificial price drop has increased American consumption by 450,000 barrels of oil a day. But domestically we're producing 790,000 barrels less a day.

We're again fat, happy, complacent, and grossly dependent on the mercy of OPEC—ideal patsies for the next price surge.

But this time, we may not be able to respond. Our domestic industry is in a state of near collapse. Those skilled in finding and producing oil have been

forced to leave the industry in droves. Some of the surviving producers are moving their capital and expertise overseas—to those countries which have had the foresight to encourage energy development at home.

And Washington remains silent—its failure to address this national issue a pitiful commentary on our ability to forestall a crisis by acting before disaster strikes.

□ 1240

#### THE VETO OF THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of concern in the First District of West Virginia over the President's veto of the much needed highway bill. I share that concern. Economic development are the watchwords there where the much-touted economic recovery of the mid-1980's failed to show up.

There are two key factors in the battle to revitalize the economy in many parts of America—jobs and roads. Both are absolutely indispensable to every economic development plan put forward, and both are benefits that would be realized through implementation of the highway bill.

In my district, West Virginians make steel, much of which could be used in the rehabilitation of our aging infrastructures nationwide, and we make a thousand other products that must be transported to market over highways that are deteriorating.

When the President put his stamp of disapproval on the highway bill, he placed a handicap upon the efforts of those same West Virginians, and a host of other Americans, who are working hard to improve their economy.

Some have said that the President is trying to show he is tough by vetoing this important legislation. I hope that the Congress will demonstrate—by overriding the President's veto—that a better way of being tough is to put people back to work.

#### SUPER DISCOVERY IN SUPERCONDUCTORS

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, if some of you are tired of Irangate, insider trading and a lot of other inside the beltway stories, here is something very different.

On the cover of this week's Business Week magazine is an article called Superconductors, and let me just read from this cover story:

Every so often a new technology spurs immense change. Now comes superconductivity. Scientists have long known that certain metals conduct electricity with no resistance when they are cooled to absolute zero ( $-459^{\circ}\text{F}$ ), but that was far too cold for practical use. Now in a series of breathtaking events, scientists have raised the superconductivity threshold to practical levels. The possibilities are stunning; electric cars, super fast trains that ride on magnetic fields, more powerful computers, and a revolution in the way we generate, transmit and store electricity.

Quoting from a yesterday's lead editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

At a scientific colloquium in New York on March 18, Bell Lab's physicist Bertram Batlogg stood before a hall crammed with excited colleagues and spoke six words that may become history's signature for the superconductivity revolution, I think our life has changed.

The process goes on. Researchers from all over the world, particularly our competition in Japan, are taking an extraordinarily active role in bringing this new technology, this new scientific discovery, to the fore.

Quoting from a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, "the objective, says Japan's leading business newspaper, is to organize industry to get the jump on the West in applications and commercialization for a huge new market."

We are talking about invention the likes of which we have not seen perhaps since the transistor, since the light bulb.

This country can and should mobilize its resources like it has not done in the past—perhaps to do something like we are talking about in "Sematech," the industrywide, government-involved partnership to promote our high-tech competitive edge in semiconductors, but do it before we fall behind our leading competitors.

We can envision technological changes across the length and breadth of the world's economy derived from this breakthrough. The United States can be at the forefront of applying and commercializing this technology but we will need to accelerate the time we've taken in the past between scientific discovery and application.

We need to be far more aggressive if we're not to be outrun by competitor nations, primarily Japan.

#### INDIANA UNIVERSITY HOOSIERS COME AWAY WITH BIGGEST PRIZE IN COLLEGE BASKETBALL

(Mr. McCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I guess for some reason nearly all the Indiana congressional delegation is down here for 1-minute speeches today. I know we are concerned about the highway bill, but we are also very

happy and indeed overwhelmed about the very, very happy events of last night in New Orleans, when the Indiana University Hoosiers came away with the biggest prize in college basketball—the NCAA championship.

In a world often dominated by bad news, these Hurryin' Hoosiers have shown us the best in athletic competition. They have shown us hard work, discipline, and the desire to do one's best are more important than being called the best.

Indiana Coach Bob Knight is said to have his detractors—but no one doubts his integrity or his commitment to teaching young people to be the best they can possibly be—on the basketball court, in the classroom, or throughout their lives.

So to Indiana University, seniors Steve Alford, Daryl Thomas, and Todd Meier, to sharp-shooting Keith Smart and to all team members, to the coach and Indiana University, we thank you for an experience inspiring us all.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO INDIANA HOOSIERS

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY], who stole Indiana University from me 5 years ago, but proud today to join him in congratulating the victory.

Five and a half months ago 290 division I teams started practicing for the 1986-87 collegiate basketball season. Three weeks ago that field was narrowed down to 64 toward the national championship for the NCAA basketball championship. Last Saturday, four teams, the Syracuse Orangemen, the Providence Friars, the UNLV Running Rebels, and the Hurryin' Hoosiers from Indiana, met on the basketball court at the Superdome in New Orleans. Last night more than 67,000 cheering fans in New Orleans and millions on television watched the Syracuse Orangemen and the Indiana Hurryin' Hoosiers, play maybe one of the closest and hardest fought basketball games in the more than 50 years of championship basketball for the NCAA national championship. With 5 seconds left, Syracuse leading Indiana by a score of 73 to 72, Indiana possessing the ball, down in the corner went a junior guard by the name of Keith Smart—Smart fired away, swish, with 1 second left.

Indiana had come from behind to win the national championship of the NCAA, 74-73.

Today we are proud of that Hoosier team and our coach, Bob Knight.



Someone asked earlier, "What is a Hoosier?"

Well, today it is someone who is proud of basketball, proud to live in Indiana, proud of Bob Knight, and proud of our Indiana basketball team. A Hoosier is someone today who believes that the Oscar for best acting was not won by one person, but by a team, we call the "Hoosiers."

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO STEVE ALFORD, BOBBY KNIGHT, AND THE ENTIRE HOOSIERS' TEAM

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, it should be no surprise to my colleagues what we Hoosiers are crowing about today: the Indiana University victory last night.

The Hoosier love affair with basketball is no secret and this year has been documented from New Orleans to Hollywood.

But there is added crowing in the part of the State I have the honor to represent, because Steve Alford as all the world should know hails from New Castle.

In his illustrious college career not only has Steve distinguished himself as one of the greatest players in NCAA history, but he has done it in a manner that has made all of us Hoosiers even prouder.

His composure, class and grace under pressure combined with his enormous talent is a fine example for his peers and our Nation's young people. He is a credit to his parents, Sam and Sharon Alford and the whole New Castle community.

I trust there is no doubt in anyone's mind why we are proud of Steve Alford, Bobby Knight, and the entire Hoosiers' team.

□ 1250

#### COMMENDING BOBBY KNIGHT AND INDIANA UNIVERSITY ON CAPTURE OF NCAA TITLE

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to take a good look at this headline: "Indiana Captures NCAA Title."

But that does not tell it all. Last night Bob Knight joined the ranks of Adolph Rupp and Johnny Wooden, another man from Indiana, as one of the greatest basketball coaches of all time. He's won three National Championships—IU has a total of five. Bobby Knight is a premier basketball coach, and I think that we all ought to applaud him. He has been maligned many times over the past few years be-

cause of his tactics, but Bobby Knight proved last night that he is extraordinary and entitled to be called "General". He coached the game much like Gen. George Patton directed a battle.

The way he coached the last minute of play was masterful. IU was three points behind, and when IU scored with 30 seconds left to cut the lead to one, the general immediately called for a timeout. He told his team to foul someone on the inbound pass. That took 2 seconds, leaving 28 seconds. He then called another timeout to put pressure on the Syracuse free throw shooter.

The strategy worked. IU came down the floor and when they couldn't get the ball to Steve Alford, their ace, they got it to Keith Smart who made the basket with 4 seconds on the clock. The rest is history—but it was the general who really won the game. Bob Knight's team had great players—Steve Alford—Keith Smart, Darryl Thomas, Dean Garrett, Ricky Calloway, and subs like Steve Eyl, Joe Hillman, Kreigh Smith and Todd Meier. But the real hero in my opinion was the great Indiana coach.

Bob Knight makes me proud to be a Hoosier, and proud to be an American.

#### THE PRESIDENT IS WRONG ABOUT THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remark.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the Surface Transportation Act, the President is either lying or once again being misled by his staff.

This legislation does not bust anyone's budget, including the President's own submission to us in January. He proposed a 5-year spending plan of \$68.5 billion, and this bill contains \$68.8 billion.

If we do not enact this bill, it will be months before the complex and controversial provisions of the administration's bill can be considered. The President is also not telling the truth when he says a new bill can be back in a week. His legislation contains several dozen major changes in transportation policy.

If we vote this fiscally prudent bill down today, then the Nation's highway and transit program will close not for a week, but for many months.

I understand the President's desire to show he is still tall in the saddle, but that should not come at the sacrifice of transportation. I do not think that we want the roads to deteriorate to a point where we are all having to ride horses.

#### SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, how often have I heard Members come to the floor and blame the deficits of the last few years on the President of the United States? And how often they have said that if the President would just do what is necessary to keep down spending, he would have support in this House.

Well, today we will find that out. The President earlier this year vetoed a Clean Water Act. Many of us in this House, myself included, voted to override the President that time, even though the President was right—that was a budget buster.

Now the President has vetoed another budget buster, the highway bill. And now we are going to find out how many Members of this House are willing to stand up and vote to keep down the deficit. My guess is that it will be a vast majority of Members here who will vote to spend more, to increase the deficit.

What will they vote to spend more on? Well, we are going to vote for some demonstration projects. They are pork, but they are called demonstration projects. For instance, we are going to have a demonstration project to show that you can move more cars down a four-lane highway than you can down a two-lane highway. Is that not something? Do not Americans really need that demonstrated to them?

We are also going to vote to build a parking lot—to build a parking lot, mind you—for a railroad station that does not exist, for a railroad that does not exist. And it is going to cost \$3 million.

I think that the President is right when he vetoes a bill like that. We ought to support him.

#### LET US VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO OF HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most famous lines from the movie "Back to the Future," is "Where we're going we don't need roads." The President likes the line so much, he quoted it last year in his State of the Union Address. Unfortunately, he also seems to have taken it to heart.

Well, the day may be coming when in fact we may not need roads. But, Mr. President, it isn't here yet.

We still need roads, and bridges. The safety of our citizens and the health of our Nation's commerce demand that roads and bridges be in good repair. In

1982 we recognized this fact, and adopted an increased gasoline tax just to pay for the billions of dollars of necessary repairs. That tax has yielded a surplus for the highway trust fund. The national rebuilding project is now well underway, and it is yielding good results.

Now, due to the political posturing of this administration, an entire construction season is jeopardized. We risk the loss of as many as 800,000 jobs. In the end, if this veto is sustained, the costs of hundreds of projects will be increased.

In vetoing this bill, the President rounded up the usual suspects, Mr. Budget Buster and Mr. Pork Barrel.

We ask you Mr. President, how is a bill which includes a decline of nearly 9 percent in funding for all Federal highway programs this year, a budget buster? And, how is legislation which includes only 1.3 percent for new demonstration projects, pork barrel? Is the problem that Congress has made the decisions and not the White House?

The President's veto is confrontation for confrontation's sake. There is no merit to it. I call on my colleagues to vote for America's commerce and for a strong infrastructure for her economy. I call on you to vote for safe roads and bridges for our citizens.

Let's keep our people working. Let's continue the process of rebuilding America's roads. Let's vote to override the veto.

#### COMMENDING SUSAN BUTCHER, WINNER OF THE IDITEROD RACE

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I stand in this well today and recognize another great sport. Not only does Indiana have sports, but Alaska has just finished the greatest sport of all, the longest race left to mankind—a race that covers 1,100 miles that was finished in a little less than 11 days, a little over 100 miles a day.

We are now selling T-shirts in Alaska that say: "Alaska—Where men are men, and women win the Iditerod race."

Today I speak in honor of Susan Butcher. Not only has she won it once, she has won it twice, 2 years in a row. She has won it more times than any other person other than Rick Swenson.

This is an honor only for the lady but for the dogs that she has driven. She has been noticed for her kindness, for her leadership, and her caring for her animals.

This is a great remaining sport that challenges the individual, that challenges Alaska, and that challenges the

whole concept of the rights of the individual.

Susan, may I say this to you—a job well done. Susan Butcher.

#### AIRLINE PASSENGER EQUITY ACT

(Mr. DeFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago Congress deregulated the airline industry in order to increase consumer choice and open the market to new business. This has not been the long-term result.

Since 1978, 235 carriers have been certified. However, only 75 are certified today. Of those 75, 9 airlines control 94 percent of the revenue-passenger-miles. This industry is not the same as it was in 1978 and continues to change with each merger.

As fare wars escalate, customer service tends to pay the price. Let's make one very important point clear, deregulation was intended to deregulate routes and rates, not consumer service. It is time that consumers stopped being the victims and instead were the beneficiaries of deregulation.

Today, Senator HOWARD METZENBAUM and I are introducing legislation that addresses the problems most often experienced by airline consumers.

The Airline Passenger Equity Act would give consumers a place to go to get information on an airline's performance in the areas of: luggage delivery, on time take off and arrivals, bumping. The Department of Transportation would be required to create a toll-free hotline to give information and assist with complaints. Other provisions of this bill would protect consumers from misleading advertising, make airline policies and performance accessible and easy to read.

I am sure that each of my colleagues or your constituents have experienced frustration with air travel. If so, I urge them to cosponsor the Airline Passenger Equity Act.

#### HIGHWAY BILL OVERRIDE WINS ON THE MERITS

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the vote today on the highway bill is not on the merits of the issue, because the Nation clearly needs this legislation, but on the President's political fortunes and his efforts to trash the Congress for partisan political advantage.

The President wants to show that he is back, that he has recovered from

the negative consequences of the Iran-Contra affair. The victims of this macho exercise will be the American people. An important bill that repairs many of our highways and bridges, that is under budget, that provides nearly 1 million jobs and has overwhelming bipartisan support may never see the light of day.

□ 1300

Whatever happened to the President's new spirit of compromise that he has promised us in his recent speech? Whatever happened to Howard Baker and the new White House team and their efforts to work with the Congress rather than to fight? Is this a portent of things to come? Will the President work with us on the budget, on trade, on arms control, or will it be confrontation and paralysis for the remainder of his term?

Let us override the President on the highway bill.

Mr. Speaker, late last week the U.S. House and Senate passed the Surface Transportation Act of 1987. This act, carefully worked out over many months, authorizes highway and public transportation programs through fiscal year 1991. President Reagan has threatened to veto the bill which passed by a 407-to-17 vote in the House and by 79 to 17 in the Senate.

If Congress fails to override the President's promised veto, it is highly unlikely that any resolution of the highway/public transportation funding crisis would take place until fall. No funds can be spent from annual revenues or the highway trust fund, which includes "transit penny" of the Federal gasoline tax, until the issue is resolved. If the veto is sustained, the following impacts will occur to New Mexico:

No funds will be available this year for the section 16(b)(2) program which provides vehicles and other equipment for specialized elderly and handicapped transportation. Over 200 vehicles have been purchased in the past under this program to provide assistance to the elderly and handicapped. Preliminary indications are that grant applications totaling \$900,000 will be received this year. In past years, New Mexico has received about \$200,000 in section 16(b)(2) funds annually.

Section 18 funds for rural areas and cities under 50,000 population in future years will be impacted either through delays or reductions in amounts available or both. Although money is available for the present fiscal year, the present operators throughout New Mexico will be competing among themselves and with proposed new operations for a small statewide allocation. Currently available funds for section 18 distribution are \$514,936 down from \$529,520 last year. Preliminary letters of intent indicate that grant applications will total \$1,700,000.

Section 9 funds for cities like Albuquerque, Santa Fe, and Las Cruces will be reduced. This is a result of shifting funding for section 9 entirely from general revenues to partially from general revenues and partially from the highway trust fund mass transit account. Again, trust fund moneys cannot be spent if



the present bill is vetoed. A new bill would have to be written, passed and signed by the President.

Section 3 discretionary money for capital projects—buses, terminals, maintenance facilities—which section 9 and section 18 operators may be able to apply for will also not be available. Section 3 is funded entirely out of the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. A delay in resolving this issue until fall would mean no money available in Albuquerque and Las Cruces would be seriously hampered and proposed development of a transit system in Santa Fe would be threatened.

Section 8 planning money in Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Las Cruces, and the State would not be available this year forcing serious delays in the required ongoing planning process in these cities.

Failure to pass the Surface Transportation Act of 1987 would force Congress to write another multiyear authorization bill, or come up with some short-term interim solution. Either of these alternatives would probably provide less money for public transportation.

New Mexico lags behind other States in the provision of public transportation. Strong demand for improving and expanding public transportation is evidenced in many ways. For example, the number and dollar amount of requests for Federal assistance has risen every year for the past 4 years. At the same time, Federal assistance has decreased by over 20 percent. The Surface Transportation Act of 1987 would stabilize the authority for public transportation funding for the next 5 years.

Transportation is a key of economic development. Citizens need to have access to employment opportunities, medical and social services, shopping and recreation. For the young, for senior citizens, for households without automobiles, and for those who desire an alternative mode, public transportation is an essential service. Public transportation ridership has grown 25 percent nationally in the past decade.

#### THE VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE VETO OF THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. I rise today in support of a thriving American economy, in support of full employment, in support of the safety of American citizens, and in support of a strong national infrastructure. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the veto override and enactment into law of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act.

The reality is that without this legislation, there will not be a 1987 highway construction season. Some \$17 billion in construction will be lost to the economy. Hundreds of thousands of workers will lose their jobs.

Critical safety needs across the Nation will go unmet. Three projects in my district alone are at risk: completion of the "Can of Worms" which will make thousands of commuters

safer every day; a pedestrian walkway in Pavilion, NY, which will protect elementary school children from a dangerous highway; and reconstruction of the Brooks Avenue bridge, which will deter heavy truck traffic from traveling through surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Unless we pass this bill, the greatest public works project ever undertaken—the 42,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, begun 30 years ago—will remain incomplete. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to join me in voting for growth, jobs, safety, and infrastructure. Let us enact the Surface Transportation Act into law.

#### THE LOGIC OF LABELING H.R. 2 A "BUDGET-BUSTER"

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower, on three separate occasions, kept this country out of unnecessary war. It was true at Dien Bien Phu in 1954 in the Indochina War; it was true in Hungary; and it was true in the 1956 Mideast War.

Instead, he built an Interstate Highway System. Mr. President Eisenhower, somehow I have faith you are listening and are as puzzled as I am at the proposition that the Interstate Highway System is a budget-buster and star wars is not.

#### COMPETITIVENESS AND COST CALL FOR HIGHWAY BILL OVERRIDE

(Mr. MOODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the President has vetoed the highway bill. As we consider whether to override or sustain the veto, let us consider the bill with regard to: First, national competitiveness; and second, budget costs.

Competitiveness is one of the administration's top priorities. The President's veto to scuttle the highway bill, however, is anticompetitive. Efficient transportation and an adequate infrastructure are key to reducing unit costs of goods sold here and abroad. More than 35,000 bridges in the federal system are now structurally deficient, 628 having already been closed, and many thousands of miles of road are substandard and need upgrading.

All this puts us at a national competitive disadvantage in transporting American goods. The 5-year highway bill before us would put us on an important, responsible path toward improving our competitive position.

Second, let's look at budget cost. The President claims that Social Security spending can never be a budget-buster because it is funded by the

trust fund, but he doesn't apply that reasoning to the highway trust fund. More significantly, this bill reduces highway spending below the levels of 1985 and 1986 by 12 and 10 percent, respectively. It is entirely under the Gramm-Rudman 1987 budget limits. Meanwhile, there is a surplus of almost \$10 billion in the highway trust fund.

In January, the President himself proposed a \$68.5 billion, 5-year highway program—a level only \$300 million, or \$60 million a year, or 25 cents per person—less than a bill he now calls too expensive. That minuscule difference indicates the veto is really a political veto. Political vetoes are a luxury our highway system cannot afford.

Let us not jeopardize 800,000 jobs; let us not postpone upgrading our transportation system; let us not undermine our national goal of competitiveness. Let us override the President's veto on the highway bill.

#### REBUTTING THE PRESIDENT ON THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the effort to override President Reagan's veto of the highway bill of 1987. As a member of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, I believe that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider during the 100th Congress.

It is with a sense of righteous indignation that I stand here to rebut the President. Some 800,000 people around the Nation who work in the highway construction industry may lose their jobs if we permit this veto to stand.

Mr. President, obviously you have chosen the wrong issue to show you're back in the saddle. The only thing you're doing is jeopardizing the employment of thousands of Americans and at the same time staggering the economies of many States throughout the Nation. Moreover, if we do not authorize this money, we stand to kill the highway building cycle for the current year.

In the State of Georgia more than \$300 million for construction will be lost this year. Needless to say, it will devastate our economy. The bulk of this money will not be used for new roads or bridges. But just to save the roads and bridges which have already been built which are in dire need of repair. I challenge members in the House and the Senate to send a strong signal to the President that we will not just roll over and play dead on this issue; instead we will stand up for the

people back home who are counting on us to provide safe roads and jobs.

# YOU CAN BET YOUR SPRING PETUNIAS ON THIS VOTE, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. RAVENEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, down where I come from in South Carolina, there is a little island town called the Isle of Palms. Most of you have probably never heard of it. Many thousands of people live there. It has no bridge of its own. The folks who live on the Isle of Palms have to use a bridge across another island, where there is only a functionally obsolete bridge to the mainland.

Politically speaking, there is no way to replace the functionally obsolete bridge. For 10 years, my predecessor and the Congressman before him have been trying to get a demonstration project made to serve this little island.

You can bet your spring petunias that this Congressman is going to vote to override and save that \$15,230,000. President Reagan? "He ain't gonna be runnin' in 1988; but I am."

# TODAY WE VOTE TO FREE A HOSTAGE—THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today we vote to free a hostage. The highway bill has been vetoed to hold it hostage and use it as ransom for the President's tarnished popularity.

I am confident that, on the merits, the House will vote to override; but if we do not, the White House surely should not claim victory when hardly a third of this body support the President.

A bipartisan majority oppose the veto as bad public policy. In fact, we have had only one person speak in favor of the President's veto during this entire 1-minute speech period.

The vote on the veto should not be treated as it has been by the White House, as an athletic contest: "Win one for the President." It is a major public policy issue that will decide the future of our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

Members should have the long-term economic well-being of the Nation at heart when they vote today, not the short-term political fortunes of the President.

□ 1310

The highway bill we will vote on does not bust the budget; it is well within the budget. It spends less each year than the highway trust fund takes in, almost \$2 billion less. In fact

there is \$10 billion in user taxes, unspent, languishing in the highway trust fund, covering up \$10 billion of the Reagan deficit and not building highways or repairing bridges for the people who paid those taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote to override that ill-considered veto.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE SATELLITE TELEVISION FAIR MARKETING ACT

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce major new satellite television viewing rights legislation for all consumers including home satellite television dishowners today with my respected colleagues JUDG GREGG, CHARLIE ROSE, and JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, and some 30 other original cosponsors.

This legislation encourages the marketplace delivery of scrambled satellite services while placing limitations on the ability of publicly funded programmers to deny their programming to dishowners.

Our bill is the result of investigation and two sets of hearings last year during which we were assured by distributors that the marketplace was rapidly working out the problems facing consumers who use satellite dishes. That has not occurred.

Our bill does not prohibit scrambling. Those who choose to scramble their signals may do so—they must simply establish reasonable business standards which do not discriminate in prices, terms or conditions—to ensure that services will be available to dishowners.

Our legislation charges the FCC with establishing uniform encryption standard—so consumers will not have to purchase many different decoding devices.

With some 2 million home Earth satellite dishes throughout the Nation, we need legislation to ensure access to programming. Our legislation will benefit consumers by giving them a choice.

I urge our colleagues to join us in this important effort.

# A VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE VETO WILL INCREASE SAFETY, JOBS, AND DEMAND FOR STEEL PRODUCTS

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as President of the Indiana Society of Washington, I would also like to congratulate Indiana University but especially point out to this House not so

much their skills in athletic endeavors, but also the fine academic institution that it represents, not only in the city of Bloomington, but throughout the State of Indiana.

My real purpose for my 1 minute, however, is to ask all Members of this body to vote to override the President's veto. The bill was fashioned by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and is a responsible one. It is under the 1986 budget. There will be more money in the trust fund after the extension of the authorization period than we have in the fund at this present time.

Additionally, I would address the safety question. The President has complained about the demonstration aspects of this program. However, there are two demonstration programs in northwest Indiana and both are vital to the safety of all people traveling in interstate commerce in our society. There is one interchange that can accommodate 35,000 vehicles; there are now 70,000 vehicles that use that interchange. It desperately needs to be reconstructed.

So this is a bill that deals with safety, this is a bill that deals with employment and not just for those who work on highway construction projects.

Steel represents an extremely important component in highway construction and reconstruction. Steel in this country has been decimated. We need those highway construction projects started this year to increase demand for those steel products. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in voting to override the veto of the President.

# A VOTE TO OVERRIDE WILL RELIEVE THE GRIDLOCK NOW EXPERIENCED IN OUR CITIES

(Mrs. BOXER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I do hope the House will strongly override the President's veto of the highway and transit bill. We need this bill. It is not frivolous. It is funded by the gas tax that we all pay just for the purpose of rebuilding our roads and transit systems.

The President calls this bill pork. Well, I invite him to my district to sit next to me in my car during rush hour to personally witness the gridlock that we have, gridlock that will be relieved by this bill.

Mr. President, this bill is not pork; it is beef. Our job is to rebuild the Nation's highways, not to rebuild the President's image.

And if you really think about it, the President's image would fair far better



if he were with this Congress rather than against it.

# CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO GIVE AMERICAN CITIZENS IN U.S. TERRITORIES THE RIGHT TO VOTE FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago today this country acquired its newest territory in the Caribbean, the United States Virgin Islands which had been Danish possession until March 31, 1917.

These islands have come a long way in 70 years. We have become a vital center for U.S. activity in the eastern Caribbean—attracting 1.3 million visitors a year, and offering modern business facilities and a university that educates thousands of students from the region.

Politically, we also have progressed from colonial status to substantial self-government. We gained U.S. citizenship in 1927, elected our first unified legislature in 1954, then elected a Governor in 1970 and a delegate to this Congress in 1972.

Now—with the delegates from Guam and American Samoa and more than 110 cosponsors—we seek another basic right. Today, on this 70th anniversary, we introduce a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment giving American citizens in the U.S. territories the right to vote for President and Vice President.

There is no reason why U.S. citizens should have to give up this fundamental right just because they live in a U.S. territory. I ask for your support to ensure that Americans in the territories get to exercise the full right of their U.S. citizenship.

# ADMINISTRATION VETOES HIGHWAY BILL TODAY BUT REQUESTS ADDITIONAL BILLION DOLLARS TOMORROW

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, and I might say my colleagues on each side of the aisle and in the other body, I hope you will listen up. We have just had an astounding action taking place here in this House a few moments ago. We were to go before the Rules Committee and seek a rule for the State Department authorization bill, \$3.9 billion. We have just received word that the administration is opposing the rule because there is not enough money in the bill and will be asking you, if we get this rule tomorrow, and keeping in mind that they want you to veto the high-

way bill today, to vote for a billion dollars more tomorrow in the State Department authorization bill. I cannot believe it. The administration's policies have to be in disarray to bring this up at this time to ask us to, in effect, to ask the party to oppose the rule and ask for a billion dollars more tomorrow for a State Department authorization.

Our committee did an excellent job on this bill. We provided continuing authorization levels from last year, we worked with the minority and the majority and I might say that until 20 minutes before the committee met even my ranking minority member had not been notified of this astounding request. Here we are asked not to vote for a highway bill, but we are asking, or we are going to be asked if we get this rule that the administration is now opposing because of insufficient funding, for an additional billion dollars tomorrow for the State Department authorization.

Something has gone awry. I ask my colleagues to consider this as they vote today, knowing that if we get this rule what they are going to be asked by the administration to do tomorrow.

# UNITE IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS AND URBAN CENTERED PROGRAMS

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as we move ahead with the painful and difficult task of meeting our fiscal year 1988 budget targets, it is imperative that our Nation's local governments—such as Louisville and Jefferson County, KY, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress—retain programs which are vital to their economies today and for the years ahead.

I was greatly disappointed last year when efforts to revive the Revenue Sharing Program failed, in spite of the efforts by me and others in the House who recognized the importance of revenue sharing funding to the maintenance of essential and necessary local services.

The cities and localities are doing their best to respond to the shrinking pot of Federal dollars available to them. But, to squeeze any more—just when the rug has been pulled out from under them by the loss of revenue sharing and other Federal funds—could strain local governments and local budgets past the point of being able to fill in any of the rips of tears in the safety net.

I salute the noble efforts being made by Representative BILL GRAY, chairman of the House Budget Committee,

to preserve strong, vital urban components in the fiscal year 1988 budget—such as the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Urban Development Action Grant Program.

Mayor Abramson, who is a cochair of the U.S. Conference of Mayor's Task Force in the Reauthorization of Community Development Block Grants, has been a forceful and articulate advocate of urban programs both at home and here in Washington.

I hope we heed Mayor Abramson's words and unite in support of community development block grants and the other urban-centered programs when the fiscal year 1988 budget reaches the floor later this spring.

I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point a letter I received from the Honorable Jerry Abramson, mayor of the city of Louisville, which further discusses this situation.

CITY OF LOUISVILLE,  
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Louisville, KY, March 24, 1987.

Hon. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAZZOLI: As you well know, the House Budget Committee is in the process of finalizing its Budget Resolution. I appreciate very much the efforts of that committee to construct a budget blueprint that is fair and equitable and yet attempts to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets. The committee will also determine if some form of revenue enhancement is possible, as well as make the necessary but unfortunate program cuts in order to meet those targets.

Among the many worthy and successful programs on the chopping block are CDBG, UDAG and EDA. Each one of these vital urban development programs provides Louisville with essential funds that allow us to provide our citizens with services that address a wide variety of basic human needs.

Cities have already suffered the brunt of recent federal budget cuts—a 68 percent cut in urban programs over the last several years. As a result, cities like Louisville are faced with greater demands for services with fewer funds to provide them.

The CDBG program in particular has been one of the most successful programs in the revitalization of Louisville. There are hundreds of examples of how CDBG funds are used in Louisville and other Kentucky cities to provide human needs services to low and moderate income people.

I implore you to fully consider this critical program of the federal-city partnership as you undertake your budget deliberations and discuss issues with Budget Committee members. Simply put, Kentucky cities cannot afford a reduction in funding in this indispensable program.

Sincerely,  
JERRY E. ABRAMSON,  
Mayor.

□ 1320

# OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every worthy cause today has some benefit. First, there is the Band Aid; then there is the Farm Aid; and I guess what we are dealing with today is highway aid.

We are fighting on behalf of the American driver. In my State of South Carolina, in my district, we are desperate for access highways. We have people who are out of jobs in my district because we do not have the access to attract new jobs and new industry.

This bill today, the highway bill, will mean \$148 million to my State of South Carolina. This will go but a small way in meeting our needs, but this is a start.

I ask that my colleagues join with me today in voting to override the President's veto of the highway bill.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO SYRACUSE AND INDIANA

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, as a proud alumnus of Syracuse University, I rise to congratulate the University of Indiana basketball team, its coaches, its supporters in this House and around the country for the national championship which they gained last night. It was truly an outstanding achievement.

At the same time, I want to celebrate the magnificent accomplishment of the Syracuse University basketball team, which came within 1 point of achieving that national championship itself. Skillfully coached by Jim Boeheim, underdogs down to the end, they played with heart and skill. They will be back again next year.

Congratulations to both Syracuse and Indiana.

#### THE GREAT AND POWERFUL WIZARD

(Mr. WHEAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, some Republicans seem to think the road back to a restored Presidency is paved with vetoes.

The Pat Buchanan veto strategy sounds a lot like wishful thinking. It's kind of like the yellow brick road back to the magical land of Oz ruled by the great and powerful wizard in the White House.

Some Republicans seem to think they need this great and powerful wizard in order to find their courage, to show they have a heart and a brain. I sincerely hope that the 407 House Members and 79 Senators who voted for the highway bill in the first place will not quake and tremble before the great Oz. I hope they will realize that they can be courageous and smart and

compassionate without the public relations hocus-pocus of the wizard.

While it might be exhilarating and exciting for some to think they can recapture the magic of a wondrous dreamland in which roads appears out of nowhere without having to be paid for, more realistic and sober minds will recognize that back in Kansas—and elsewhere across America—the people need and deserve better, safer roads and bridges and mass transit.

#### TIME TO SAY NO TO PAKISTANI NUCLEAR BOMB

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, American nuclear arms policy rests on three principles: nuclear stability, American credibility, and arms control verification. We're ignoring all three in Pakistan.

The looming nuclear arms race between Pakistan and India means unprecedented peril. Pakistan and India can build nuclear bombs. But they can't build secure second-strike delivery systems, and geography gives them no warning time. If they build bombs, a small border crisis could quickly become a nuclear war.

So much for nuclear stability.

We've made our nonproliferation policy clear as day to General Zia. And General Zia has thumbed his nose at us, while getting F-16's, Harpoon missiles, and Abrams tanks.

So much for American credibility.

Now, General Zia did promise President Reagan he wouldn't produce weapons grade uranium. But he has been lying, and we have taken no steps to ensure compliance with the agreement.

So much for verification.

Mr. Speaker, we can stop the Pakistani nuclear bomb if we stand firmly by our principles, rather than letting General Zia bully us. Aid to the Afghan rebels is a red herring: Pakistan will support them regardless of what we do. It's in their own interest.

It's time to say no to the Pakistani nuclear bomb.

#### OVERRIDING THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the motion to override the President's veto on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

The substitute administration bill would cost 35,000 jobs annually over the next 5 years. In fact, the failure to pass a highway-transit bill will result in the loss of 800,000 jobs for this

fiscal year alone. The State of Texas would lose about 16,000 jobs as well as an apportionment of nearly \$900 million. In particular, my congressional district will lose \$13 million in essential highway funding.

The President contends that H.R. 2 is a budget-buster. However, the demonstration projects that he so vehemently objects to constitute only 1 percent of the bill's total \$88 billion authorization.

I urge all Members to join me in overriding this veto.

#### H.R. 1777—FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take this 1 minute, but in view of what has been said here concerning the Foreign Relations Authorization Act and the position of the administration thereon, I think that I had better take this time.

We had this matter before us this morning in the Committee on Rules. It was pointed out that the administration opposed this act, not for one reason, insufficient funding, as was emphasized here just a few moments ago on the floor, but for six reasons. Six reasons.

Let me read those six reasons. The administration would support H.R. 1777 if amended to increase funding to conform to the levels requested by the administration, which are essential to an effective foreign affairs program; two, delete earmarking provisions which would unduly limit Presidential discretion and flexibility; three, delete section 134, which creates an unnecessary Bureau of South Asian Affairs that would reduce funding for other important programs; four, delete section 144, which expands the Foreign Service Grievance Board authority, because these amendments are inappropriate and would infringe upon the Secretary of State's management authority; five, delete the part of section 142 that would provide unwarranted benefits for certain former spouses of still-living participants unlike civil service retirement where such benefits have never been provided on a retroactive basis or without deduction from the benefit of the participant; and six, delete section 303, contractor requirements, which would give American firms preference in Voice of American modernization projects because it is counter to the administration's policy of promoting free trade, would restrict competition, and would raise costs.

I think the House is entitled to know these other five reasons in addition to the one set forth previously.



# AUTHORIZING 1987 SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY TO BE RUN THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the 1987 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from America Samoa?

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I take this time for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. SUNIA], for an explanation of the resolution.

□ 1330

Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also thank the gentleman for his cooperation on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 91 authorizes the 1987 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics spring games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia, on or about May 29, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, currently there is a provision in the law prohibiting torches from being carried on the Capitol Grounds. The Congress did pass special legislation in 1984 so that the Olympic torch could be carried through the Capitol Grounds on its way to the Olympics in Los Angeles, and again, in 1986 for the Special Olympics held at Gallaudet University. This resolution does the same thing for the Special Olympics to be held at Gallaudet University in 1987. Mr. Speaker, the Special Olympics, founded in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, provides year-round training and competition to any individual age 8 or older who is mentally retarded. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation is a very positive step toward promoting interest in the Special Olympics and I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would add that this resolution has been cleared by the leadership on our side. The Special Olympics Torch Relay to be held in Washington in May certainly deserves our support and is just one part of a nationwide effort. The Diplomatic Security Service is to be commended for their efforts in organizing this year's relay and I am pleased to support this legis-

lation which will lead to a successful D.C. run.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have introduced this concurrent resolution which will authorize the 1987 Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to use the U.S. Capitol Grounds for its torch-lighting ceremony, thereby initiating the Special Olympics Torch Relay leading from the Capitol to Gallaudet University for the 1987 Special Olympics spring games.

Founded in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, the Special Olympics Program offers year-round training and competition in 14 official sports to any individual with mental retardation, age 8 and up. More than 1 million athletes in over 20,000 communities in the United States and 50 foreign countries participate in Special Olympics. Approximately 900 athletes will compete in the D.C. spring games in five areas: Aquatics, track and field, gymnastics, volleyball, and softball.

I am pleased that the Diplomatic Security Service has been given the opportunity to coordinate this year's run and to continue the fine tradition of District law enforcement efforts on behalf of Special Olympics.

As a strong supporter of this program, I am honored to offer this legislation which will assist in drawing greater attention to the importance of the Special Olympics Games and to the participation of over 900 mentally retarded youngsters in the D.C. games alone.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a press release distributed by the Bureau of Diplomatic Security detailing the law enforcement torch run for the 1987 D.C. Special Olympics:

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL NAMED DIRECTOR OF D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

WASHINGTON.—Lou Schwartz, Director of the State Department's Diplomatic Security Service, has been named Director of the Law Enforcement Torch Run for the District of Columbia Special Olympics, to be held May 29, 1987.

The D.C. Law Enforcement Torch Run is part of a nationwide series of runs to benefit the world's largest sports program, Special Olympics, for persons with mental retardation.

This spring, an estimated 15,000 law enforcement officers will run intra-state relays carrying the lighted Special Olympics Torch, with local residents pledging monies per runner to benefit Special Olympics. The D.C. run will culminate at the opening ceremonies of D.C.'s Special Olympic Spring Games which will be held on May 29-30 on the campus of Gallaudet University.

As D.C. Torch Run Director, Schwartz is responsible for planning the route, recruiting runners and coordinating local fund raising efforts.

The Diplomatic Security Service is supporting this year's Law Enforcement Torch Run, coordinating an estimated 40 federal and district law enforcement agencies.

"I am pleased that the Diplomatic Security Service has the opportunity to coordinate this year's run and carry on the fine example the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms did in 1986," Schwartz said, "We hope to involve 900 runners and raise \$10,000 for the D.C. Special Olympics."

Founded in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, Special Olympics offers year round training and competition in 14 official

sports to any individual with mental retardation, age 8 and up. More than one million athletes in over 20,000 communities in the U.S. and 50 foreign countries participate in Special Olympics. Approximately 900 athletes will compete in the D.C. Spring Games in five areas: aquatics, track and field, gymnastics, volleyball and softball.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 91, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the Honorable DAN MICA, which authorizes the 1987 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics Games to be held at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia on May 29, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Law Enforcement Torch Run is part of a nationwide series of runs to benefit the world's largest sports program, Special Olympics, for persons with mental retardation. The Special Olympics, founded in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, has proven to be a very worthy program designed to help those who are most deserving. The Special Olympics Torch Relay is a very positive step toward promoting interest in the Special Olympics, while also raising much needed funds to ensure that the Special Olympics experience can continue to grow.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 91

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On May 29, 1987, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may designate jointly, the 1987 Special Olympics Torch Relay may be run through the Capitol Grounds, as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics Spring Games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary to carry out section 1.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event authorized by section 1.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

**SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1987—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 25, 1987, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that all time yielded today will be for debate purposes only, and, therefore, I yield, for debate purposes only, 30 minutes to the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] and, Mr. Speaker, pending that, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge all my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2, the highway/transit reauthorization bill.

H.R. 2 passed the House in January on a vote of 401 to 20. On February 20, while we were in conference, Secretary Dole wrote me a letter, a letter I am confident went to other conferees as well. This was, I must point out, the only attempt at communication that the Secretary had with me during conference.

In her three-page letter, which came appended with a three-page attachment, she raised various points that needed addressing.

I want to make it crystal clear that on almost every single point, the

House either adopted the administration's position or moved significantly in that direction.

With respect to what she referred to as "special interest" demonstration projects, we reduced additional funding for these projects substantially in conference, by over 33 percent. She mentioned the LA Metrorail. Well, to the extent there is a commitment in this bill, it's not spread over 5 years as with the firm commitment that was in the initial bill. But over 8 years, significantly reducing the amount per year.

She wanted transit authorizations cut. Well, I regret to say that the conference report did cut funding from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund back by about 25 percent.

On page 2 of her letter, the Secretary said she wanted to make sure that the transit program was revised so that every State would get a share from the transit trust fund. And you know what? We did that too. I didn't like it. I am not persuaded that it is sound policy. But in the spirit of compromise, this bill contains a blending provision so that all areas over 50,000 population will not get transit trust fund money.

The Secretary wanted to cut authorizations and obligations from the highway program. We swallowed hard and did that.

The Secretary said we should address the Buy America provisions of the House bill. Well, we retained one in a modified and weakened form, and dropped another.

The Secretary said we should drop provisions we had dealing with South Africa sanctions, and we have.

Under the heading of "Additional Interstate Projects," we have not done a great deal to address the concern articulated although the conference report would codify an agreement which was entered into between her Department of Transportation and the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to issues raised in her enclosure, we did adopt the Senate provision on the national speed limit, we did address toll financing in a manner that should be recognized by one and all as a reasonable compromise. We do provide for the administrative release of interstate construction funds. We have increased funding for the discretionary bridge program. We will, generally, have a match requirement in the emergency relief program, we did drop our so-called transit-ice procedure, and on and on and on.

It should be apparent, Mr. Speaker, that we gave a great deal in conference, that we came much closer to accepting the administration's position on a wide range of important issues than I ever thought we would, or frankly, than I would have preferred.

And then our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, agreed to the conference report by a vote of 407 to 17.

It is hardly surprising then, that in urging Senators to sustain the President's veto, Senator DOLE asked that they do this, and I quote, "notwithstanding the merits." when this House has compromised as much as we have already, when we have a conference agreement as good as this one, what else could the minority leader ask, but that his colleagues vote "notwithstanding the merits."

Mr. Speaker, it is our job in passing laws, in carrying out the function that we have sworn to carry out, to pass laws based on the merits, not, "notwithstanding the merits."

Mr. Speaker, in concluding let me say that this bill is not a budget buster. If there were just one aspect of this very complex legislation that could be clearly understood by every person in this country, I would hope that it would be this: That this bill is not a budget buster, that in 5 years' time there will actually be a larger unused balance in the highway trust fund than there is today.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a good conference report, and one in which we have gone miles to accommodate the administration on every issue raised by the Secretary. It's a conference report that is not a budget buster. It's a conference report that is so reasonable, its leading opponent in the Senate prefers not to argue against it on its merits, and it's a conference report which, if the veto is sustained will take months to reconstruct.

Mr. Speaker, reason, a sense of compromise and fair play, and most of all our responsibility to pass meritorious legislation, all demand that we override the President's veto.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] the very able ranking member of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have stuck with the President through thick and thin. In fact, the Congressional Quarterly says that my Reagan support score is 20 points above the average Republican support score from my region of the country. Yet I cannot in good conscience support the President on his call for sustaining this veto today.

Why? Because it is not good for America. Indeed it should be emphasized here today that this is not a partisan issue. Republicans in this House and Republicans in the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly voted in support of this legislation. The distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] sent a letter to the President urging him not to veto this bill. Howard Baker, the distin-



guished Republican Chief of Staff, attempted to dissuade the President. We have before us nevertheless a vetoed bill which is crucial to America.

There are four reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we should vote to override this ill-conceived veto.

□ 1340

The first is because the bill is urgently needed. Just yesterday, U.S.A. Today had a superlative review of the impact on the 50 States, and they said this:

That most state highway construction plans are in turmoil after President Reagan's veto of the highway bill. State officials report hundreds of projects junked or delayed, including frail bridges, and long-delayed interstate improvements.

Mountain and Northern States with short summers could lose the entire construction season, leaving thousands of road workers jobless.

Beyond that, indeed the emphasis here in part is on jobs. We are told that if this construction season is lost, we will lose more than 700,000 jobs across America. I have a list here for every State and I would be happy to share just a few of them with the Members.

California would lose 57,000 jobs; North Carolina would lose 17,000 jobs; Pennsylvania would lose 30,000 jobs; Virginia would lose 14,000; Wisconsin would lose 11,000 jobs, and on and on the list goes. That is one reason why we should override this veto.

The second reason goes beyond the rhetoric to the fact that this bill is within budget. It is within the Senate budget resolution; it is within the Gramm-Rudman budget limitations. In fact, it is less than that which was spent a year ago.

Beyond that, this trust fund has in it a surplus of \$10 billion today which, under this bill, will grow to an additional, bloated surplus of \$11 billion 5 years from now at the end of this bill if this bill is enacted. As far as the transit funding which comes out of the general fund, that is subject to appropriations so the President gets another crack at that funding.

The third reason why this veto should be overridden is because of the demonstration projects which are so important to the communities across America. It should be emphasized that these projects all together represent only 1.6 percent of the total bill. In fact, there is a certain subtle hubris around this town which says that it is OK for us to have spent \$8 billion for a Washington Metro subway system. That is statesmanship, but when Members of Congress try to provide badly needed highway and transit programs for their communities across America, that is pork barreling.

It is a double standard, Mr. Speaker; it is not right, it is unfair. We badly need these projects across America. In fact, there seems also to be the implic-

it argument that it is OK for over 90 percent of this bill to be spent based on decisions of faceless, nameless bureaucrats downtown and around the country, but it is wrong for Members of Congress who had to step up to cast the hard vote to raise the taxes to pay for this highway program; it is wrong for them to designate less than 2 percent. Less than 2 percent of the funding of this bill.

The final reason why this veto should be overridden is because of the irresponsible, blithe assertion coming from the administration that they can send a scaled-down bill up here and we can pass it in a couple of weeks. If that is the case, where was this scaled-down, simple bill a week ago, a month ago, a year ago? This bill is a year late today. There are 30 contentious issues which will have to be renegotiated from funding to formulas to tolls to the 65-mile-an-hour speed limit. If we go to work next Monday on trying to craft a new bill, it is going to be months before we bring one back.

Mr. Speaker, if this veto is sustained, we are going to lose a construction season. Indeed, I urge my colleagues to rise above politics and do what is right for America. Vote to override this ill-advised veto.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at this time that, as we know, all the time was allocated to the chairman of the committee involved. Although there are no rules or traditions on veto overrides, on conference reports we seem to have a tradition where the minority will be given one-half of the time.

It is expected in that allocation that one-third of the time for each side would be allocated to people who oppose the measure before the House. That is what has been done at this time.

It is obvious that we will not have success in finding many people on this side of the aisle asking for part of that 10-minute time. So, in order to be fair, as our committee has, we would like to state that we do not want to block out one-third of the total time to those in opposition and so we will consider, should the other side use all of its 10 minutes for that, in allocating some of our time to Members from either side of the aisle for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to override the President's veto. I say to my colleagues that I am the only Democrat in the House who voted against this bill as it was on its way to the President. I did not do so because there was too much money in the bill; I voted against it because

there was too little money in it for my State of Montana, which under this legislation, receives an almost \$13 million cut in highway money below what we received last year.

I did not originally vote against this bill because it was a budget buster. I am on the Budget Committee and I tell my colleagues that we pay close attention to bills that are budget busters. This is not one of them, and I submit now for the RECORD an analysis which I have asked the Budget Committee to prepare which shows that this legislation is \$5 million under the 302(a) allocation allowed by the Budget Committee.

[The analysis follows:]

COMPARISON OF BILL TO 302(a) ALLOCATION  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

Following is a table reflecting the discretionary amounts remaining under the 302 allocation of the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution compared to the CBO cost estimate of the conference report on H.R. 2.

Fiscal Year 1987 Budget Authority

	Millions
302(a) allocation.....	\$10,491
Enacted to date:	
Motor carrier safety grants .....	34
Water Quality Act .....	-4
Remaining under 302(a) allocation .....	10,461
Cost of conference report on H.R. 2 .....	10,456
Bill over (+)/under (-) allocation .....	-5

As shown above the conference report on H.R. 2 is within the 302(a) budget authority allocation of the 1987 budget resolution. Thus, the conference report does not violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act which requires the bill to stay within the Section 302(a) allocation for discretionary budget authority.

Thus, those who claim that the highway bill exceeds the budget are incorrect.

Nor did I vote against this bill because it is pork. The definition of pork seems to be: elected officials in the bright sunlight of committee or full House debate deciding where projects are to be located. That, apparently, is pork. However, when those decisions are made by the executive behind the curtain of secrecy, that somehow, apparently, is manna from Heaven.

Do I want this veto overridden? You bet. The construction season out our way is limited to 6 months. Late spring to early fall. We are now out of money in Montana.

We have a 120-day lead time from appropriation to contract letting. So the first of April is our deadline and if we miss it out West, particularly in Montana, we miss half our construction season. That means that 3,000 of our employees miss their jobs. It means that half of our \$90 million construction funds cannot be used. That includes, of course, the high-priority construction for safety on bridges and primary and interstate highways.

I tell my colleagues that as the only Democrat to vote against this legislation as it went to the President, it is absolutely essential that this veto be overridden if my State of Montana and other States similar to mine with short construction seasons do not lose the precious time we need to begin our construction for this year.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, Mr. HOWARD, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I would like to engage them in a colloquy to create legislative history on section 135 of the conference report relating to the regulation of tolls.

Subsequent to the House passing the conference report on H.R. 2, a number of questions have been raised as to whether section 135, or the statement of managers accompanying section 135, changes in any way the "just and reasonable" standard as it has been applied under existing laws and existing authorities. Would the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member care to comment?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from New York will yield, neither section 135 nor the statement of managers changes the standard to be applied in determining whether a toll increase is just and reasonable. The only thing that we have changed is the forum for making the determination. Toll increases will no longer be subject to review by the Department of Transportation; instead the decision will be left to the courts in the event of a challenge.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I concur with the chairman's response. We have not changed the just and reasonable standard in any way.

□ 1350

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND], a valued member of our committee.

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have heard that this highway bill is a budget buster. Nothing could be further from the facts.

I know there are those who say that the money that comes in from this is a part of overall Government revenue, that the money that comes in is a part of overall Government spending, but these are the facts. That money comes from the motoring public. It goes into a trust fund and it can only be spent on highways and mass transit. It

cannot be spent on anything else, so it is a false issue when it is said that this money is going to hurt our deficit problem.

The fact is that it is not going to do that at all. It is a false issue. By leaving that money in there it appears to reduce the deficit, when actually it does not. It just makes our deficit look less severe than it actually is.

So I think this is something the public needs to understand. This is designated revenue. It can only be spent on certain things. It does not affect our budget deficit in the least.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, what a classic case this is of that perennial perplexity we face over the national interest versus the local interest. There is relevancy in both and legitimacy in both in our deliberation over issues. Particularly today.

The legislative branch of Government was created in part to ensure that the legitimate local needs of the people are recognized and that there is a guard at the door against complete subjugation of local needs and concerns. No one else in the other two branches of Government is really charged with that responsibility to represent, defend, and promote local public interests.

That is why I have made the very difficult decision for the first time in the Reagan Presidency to vote against the President's recommendations on a major piece of legislation.

Several years ago I voted to increase the gasoline tax by 5 cents a gallon to build up the highway trust fund for the express purpose of building more roads and highways.

A good part of my congressional district in west central Illinois has been unflatteringly characterized as "Forgottonia" because it is so deficient in good roads and highways so necessary for economic development.

This bill contains funding for \$27 million in improvement and widening of U.S. Route 121, which will connect Interstate 74 on the north with Interstate 55 on the south in my home State of Illinois.

The current two-lane highway is a traffic hazard, a deterrent to the economic development of a depressed area, and a pain in the you-know-what to drive.

My constituents have strong feelings about that road, and my area's economic development badly needs it. I am here to represent those feelings and try to help meet those needs.

But there is another side of the coin as well.

The President doesn't see Route 121 as I do.

In some respects, the President sees this bill as a budget buster. It is. He sees it as yet another dangerous precedent for big, huge, omnibus bills. He's right there, to. He's looking at programs and projects in this bill that are not essential, that could be delayed or terminated.

I am looking at central Illinois, and a road that kills and injures. I am looking at economic development in a hard hit region of the rust belt, one of the hardest hit areas of the country.

The President is right, but so am I. The Washington Post is right, when it called this bill "Pork on Wheels," but so was the Escondido, CA, Times-Advocate in RON PACKARD's district when it said, "Build the roads, Jack."

I will vote to override this veto, because the U.S. 121 project in this bill and a good many others in Illinois are badly needed and could surely stand on their own before this House. As is the case in many other States.

The President needs to be reminded of that fact, and if this veto is sustained, he needs to understand the absolute necessity of getting a better highway authorization bill passed without further delay.

That goes for the Democratic leadership in this House as well. The baloney I heard last week about stonewalling on a trimmed down version if the veto is sustained, should not be heard within these walls. The rights and the responsibilities of both branches of Government are clear and right and proper here, for once.

It is the national interest versus the local interest, and it is a debate as old as public works and public budgets. It is for the executive and the legislative branches to strike the proper balance, not to subvert the public good by political brinksmanship.

This veto should have been avoided.

The fault lies in both branches of Government, the executive for again failing to consult with us in advance, and the legislative for failure to address the extraordinary dimension of the budget deficit and mandate to reduce it.

We have wasted enough time over two Congresses on the highway bill. We have in our delays, procrastination and political shenanigans, wasted enough money as well to pay for my highway project.

Let's not waste any more.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the floor to commend my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader. I know the road to which he made reference. I appreciate and com-



mend the gentleman for his courage in standing up to help override this veto.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to the opposition in considering this particular veto override vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal agree, but in this particular bill it is so bad that those two papers, major newspapers in this country, agree that the President's veto should be sustained. This bill should be killed and that we ought to pass the right bill, a bill that is aimed at trying to get the highway season going, but without major pork barrel legislation, such as the type that this has.

Under this particular bill, I would tell my colleagues as you come out here and vote, 47 of the 50 States are losing money relative to their position last year.

We heard during the debate that this is the fault of Gramm-Rudman. Well, the problem is that if you take that particularly philosophy, let me suggest to you that what has been done under the bill is that all these pork barrel projects have been built in to the Gramm-Rudman limitations, thereby cutting the formula moneys available to the States; so the pork not only is something which helps individual Members to the exclusion of other individual Members, but it also hurts States to the point of their formula not having sufficient money then to even meet the obligations of last year.

So I would suggest if you are voting for this bill because it is a good bill to help get highway construction going and help save jobs, you are really voting to cut most States over what they got last year, so that we can provide pork.

And how much pork do we provide? Well, I have the committee report here. We got one out on the floor this time dealing with the override.

There are 21 pages of pork in this bill. There is just page after page of pork barrel projects, and what do they do? We have heard these described as something we really want done.

Well, let me describe a couple of the projects for you that the American taxpayer is now going to pay for. He is going to pay to build a couple parking lots for a train station that does not exist, for a rail line that does not exist, and we are going to spend \$3 million to do that.

Now, does that sound like we sat around and prioritized these projects in such a way that we made certain that we got very, very good use of the money?

I would suggest that there are a lot of roads in my area that need to be

built that could use that \$3 million a lot more usefully than that particular project.

Here is another little project that is in the bill. It says this project will demonstrate the effectiveness of construction of parking facilities in relieving on-street parking congestion and unsafe parking practices. In other words, they are going to build a parking lot to show that it is better to park in a park in a parking lot than to have the car parked on the street. We really do need to spend millions of dollars to understand that.

I think America knows full well that is the case, and if you look through the rest of this you will find out that here is another project for the purpose of demonstrating a relationship between infrastructure improvement and economic vitality. In other words, we are going to provide a few jobs and so on to build a road. OK, sure. Americans understand that is a pretty good demonstration, but is it the kind of priority that we ought to be putting on building roads that are badly needed?

In fact, if you look through this particular report, what you will find is that most of the projects are to relieve traffic congestion. Well, I would suggest that most Americans at some point or other if they live in any kind of an urban area at all are faced with traffic congestion and would like to have a little bit of help. Are most of them going to get help under this bill? No, because if you look at this bill you will find that 14 percent of the moneys under the mass transit account are going to one city, Los Angeles. One city gets 14 percent of all the money that we all contribute, 14 percent going to one city where we all contribute the moneys.

If you look also you will find out that \$3.3 billion is ultimately going to be spent for one project in Boston, MA, to build a tunnel.

Now, you know, a lot of Americans would figure that maybe some of that money might better be used in their communities to relieve their congestion; but no, one city is going to get \$3.3 billion.

I would suggest that it is time to rewrite this bill, that it is time to say to the Members of Congress who sat around in back rooms and wrote this bill so that we could take care of a few at the expense of the many, that maybe the best thing would be to take the money, put it into the formulae of the various States so that the States can decide on a localized basis what their priorities are. That is the way we have always done it. That is the way we have done it for 75 years in this country. We have allocated the money to the States and then we have allowed local people to take a look at how that money was going to be spent

and decide which are the highest priority projects.

All of a sudden we are going to deviate from that and we do it in the wrong bill at the wrong time; so I would suggest that what we should do is save \$10.1 billion as the President wants to do, stop this budget buster.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

□ 1400

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to support the President's veto of this bill. I say "reluctantly" because I know how hard the Public Works Committee has worked on getting this bill passed, but I must vote to sustain the veto for two reasons.

One has been alluded to before—the \$2 billion for mass transit that comes from general revenue funds. More important are the issues that have not been addressed by this House, and that is waste.

If this were a defense authorization bill, we would have Members all over this floor jumping up crying, "waste, fraud, and abuse" and pointing at \$600 toilet seats. But we have not addressed up to \$500 million a year that is wasted by the Davis-Bacon Act. We have not addressed the billions of dollars abused by environmental impact statements. And we have not addressed the millions of dollars of fraud because of a labor-protection mass transit issue called section 13(c). Where are those Members that are so concerned about waste?

I had an amendment in this bill that was summarily dropped by the conference committee that would have probably saved up to 40 percent on mass transit, because my amendment very simply said that section 13(c) could not be used to inhibit privatization. Privatization is a money-saver, and it's being held hostage by unions abusing 13(c) agreements. All of the Members who are talking about saving 800,000 jobs, how many jobs would be created by \$500 million from Davis-Bacon or the billions of dollars wasted in other areas? Billions of dollars would be saved from reform in a reasonable environmental impact study. Millions of dollars would be saved if we repealed section 13(c), because right now in mass transit we have union bus drivers who are making an incredible amount of money over private union bus drivers, union mass transit mechanics who are making an incredible amount of money over private mechanics—only because mass transit systems are being held hostage by section 13(c) until they agree to union demands before they receive a Federal grant.

We have not addressed these wasteful things that are involved in highway and mass transit. Give us a

chance to address this waste. Vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] has 16 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOSCO], a member of the committee.

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows the issue today is not highways—it's the President's political recuperation. After a slow comeback, the patient is not calling for the traditional hot tea, unbuttered toast, or chicken soup—he wants the highway bill. Somehow sweltering traffic jams, unfinished highways, and some 800,000 people out of work is just the dose needed to bring the President back to full strength.

Let's we give the patient this strong medicine too quickly, let's be sure the symptoms warrant the cure. After all it was major foreign policy blunders, not highways, that brought on the ailment. Blunders attended by a mysterious forgetfulness and repeated telling of half-truths. Surely sacrifice of the highway bill can't help as a remedy here. As for forgetfulness, has the President forgotten that it was he who signed into law the measure that created a 9-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline solely for the purpose of building highways and mass transit? Has he forgotten our promise cemented in law, that this fund will be used solely for improving our Nation's transportation system? It is not another half-truth to say that this trust fund can be used to draw down the deficit? Isn't it really more truthful to say that keeping the money in the bank simply makes the Government look better, and it will just sit there, being pilfered away by inflation?

Mr. Speaker, when we vote to spend highway trust fund money we act not just as Members of Congress, but as trustees. We have collected money under the express promise that we would spend it for this specific purpose. As nice as it would be to use the highway trust fund to bolster the President's ego, I think the people would prefer to have us use it to bolster our country's transportation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy vote. It has been made very clear by many of us here that it is not an easy vote.

I have projects in this bill which I have worked in behalf of for the past several years. The Los Angeles Metrolink is very important to me, and I think that it is important that we un-

derscore the fact that in Los Angeles we only get 50 cents for every \$1 that we contribute.

I am also very concerned about ground access to the Ontario International Airport, but I think that it is also important for us to realize, as the Washington Post pointed out, that this is a States rights issue. What we have to do is look at their editorial that was in Sunday's paper called "Pork on Wheels."

They say:

President Reagan pegged it perfectly when he vetoed the highway bill Friday, calling the \$87.5-billion package "a textbook example of special-interest, pork-barrel politics at work." The shame of it in this expensive case is that Congress has ground up and jammed all its pork into one indigestible sausage containing many serious, worthy and urgent road projects that should have been financed last year. Without a bill, the economy could stand to lose hundreds of thousands of jobs, most of which are linked to the legitimate projects that state governments have approved. But the junk in this package, which also includes the 65-mph speed limit provision that deserves rejection, too, is as overwhelming as it is ill-planned: there are 121 "demonstration projects"—meaning ways for members of Congress to demonstrate their individual creativity and generosity with trust fund money, above and beyond what state governments have sought, and with no requirements for state matching money. It's hang the cost and take the credit. It also deserves the veto it generated.

Those in Congress who are urging an override of the veto point to damage that delay would do to the economy—but who wasted all the time banging this monstrosity together in the first place? Return with us now to those thrilling days of yesteryear '86, when the old 99th left a heap of highway ideas on the floor of a conference committee and adjourned. When business opened this year, who urged prompt action to avoid the damage to the states' approved projects and the jobs they generate? Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Hanford Dole called time and again for action, nothing in January that the shortage of construction money was "a growing national emergency—one that affects every community in this country."

The whole process should be scrapped in favor of increased state control of this money. More and more governors are coming to this conclusion. For now, Congress should uphold the veto, take a good, quick look at the president's alternative proposal and come up with a sensible compromise that could keep things going for now and provide time for fundamental improvements in the federal highway program before a next round can begin.

Mr. Speaker, there are 152 demonstration projects in here. We need to reanalyze it, and as these papers have said, proceed and come up with a final resolution which can be acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, in your reply to the President's State of the Union Address, you offered the challenge to "sit down and talk about real deficit reduction." No gimmicks, you said, no asset sales, and so forth.

Well, the President is giving us a real opportunity to save \$1 billion a year right here. No gimmicks, no asset sales, just real savings.

We won't have to cut important social programs which benefit the needy, nor will we have to cut into our national security goals.

Proponents of this bill tell us to ignore the 152 projects, they only cost \$1½ billion anyway. They tell us this is a fiscally tough spending level, even though it is still \$10 billion over budget. They tell us that highway spending isn't real spending anyway since it comes from the highway trust fund. So, in fact, we don't even have to worry about the budget deficit, this is only highway money. We still have a responsibility to distribute it as equitably as possible.

Mr. Speaker, this bill really is a first-class budget-buster and I will vote to uphold the President's veto. I personally disagreed with a number of the President's objections to the bill. For one, I have fought long and hard to see the Los Angeles Metrolink system receive the Federal support it deserves. Los Angeles Metrolink is possibly the most thoroughly planned and badly needed mass transit project ever, and I do not relish the thought of having to battle for its funding again.

But despite the presence of such important items in H.R. 2, I cannot vote for this bill in its present, overweight form. I am not voting against highways, or even against the particular demonstration projects, all 152 of them. On the contrary, there is much in this bill that is good—but, in fact, it is too much of a good thing. It is time we picked something to begin imposing some self-restraint.

Everyone has a favorite project in this bill and, in fact, I have one myself. Ontario International Airport, which serves eastern Los Angeles County and surrounding communities, is the fastest growing airport in the United States. Its rapid growth has been similar to that of Washington's Dulles International but in coming years will far outpace Dulles.

Unfortunately, the most modern airport is of little use unless it has adequate ground access. When improvements to the terminal itself are completed, it has been estimated that Ontario's ground traffic will increase by 50,000 cars per day. H.R. 2 provides Federal funds to demonstrate how a rapidly growing area can relieve such a strain on transportation.

Along with a bipartisan group of other California Members, I have been working to get funding for ground access improvements at Ontario Airport since my first term in Congress. Regardless of H.R. 2's fate, I will continue the fight to get this project funded.

The Ontario project is unique because State and local interests are contributing fully 47 percent of the total cost. But, as we know all too well, many demonstration projects are not so generously supported by other levels of government. In fact, their presence in the bill signals that State highway departments have already rejected them.

This is H.R. 2's greatest inconsistency: We voted to give States the rights to raise the speed limit to 65 because we correctly believed that this was the States' business. Yet, now we will provide carte blanche funding for projects that the States did not think worthy of funding. The administration's proposal would not eliminate these projects, it would just put



them back where they belong—under the States' jurisdiction and review.

One way or another, I'm sure we will find some way to deliver the most important portion of this bill, the Federal-aid highway money. We should have done that a year ago, anyway. After we do, maybe we should consider giving the States more control over the highway authorization process. They couldn't make it any less complicated and unresponsive than Congress has.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas to clarify some of the points in this bill, and I have a number of questions that I am prepared to ask.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, How do highway program spending levels compare to the President's budget request? Are they within the budget? Are they affected by Gramm-Rudman? How do they correlate?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. They compare \$68.5 billion versus \$68.8 billion within the budget resolution for fiscal 1987, so they are practically the same. The President's request is just about the same as we are enacting in this bill. Of course that comes from all the gas tax that is collected from all the people, 9 cents a gallon, and 1 penny for the Mass Transit Program.

It is within the confines of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, may I say.

Mr. UPTON. How much money will actually remain in the highway trust fund when this bill expires in 5 years? How much is there now in the trust fund, and how much will this build or shrink within 5 years?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. There is \$9.7 billion in the trust fund now. It will grow to \$11 billion by the time this 5-year bill is totally used.

Mr. UPTON. One of the concerns that I have is with the mass transit section of the bill. Will there be a later opportunity where Congress can in fact go after or reexamine the mass-transit subsidies?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. There certainly will be. It is where the President really should have looked at this legislation. He could do that through the appropriations process, and it would have been a much more logical way for him to approach this issue.

Mr. UPTON. One of the other concerns that has been raised here is the level of the demonstration projects within the bill. Would the gentleman from Arkansas be able to clarify what that is as a percent?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. A very small percent, and Members probably understand their districts far better than faceless bureaucrats do in Wash-

ington. It is 1.6 percent of all the funds.

Mr. UPTON. One last question. The Secretary of Transportation I understand does have some discretionary funds here. How does that compare to the 1.3 percent of the funds that are used for demonstration projects?

□ 1410

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. The Secretary has 6 percent of all of the funds, three times as much as the Members, the elected Members of Congress have.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the highway bill is a worthy investment in our Nation's future that will improve our transportation system, stimulate the economy, and most importantly, will improve safety for millions of motorists across America and thus lead to the saving of human lives.

In recent weeks, we have seen this vital legislation being savaged by administration officials, who have distorted the debate over the bill by injecting a motley array of extraneous issues into the discussion. In essence, they have attempted to alter the focus of the debate away from the merits of the bill, by erroneously describing it as a budget buster and by portraying the vote on the veto as a test of the President's prestige and power.

On both counts, those arguments are wrong. First, this bill should be judged on its merits, and not on any theoretical basis of what an override might do to the President's political fortunes. No thoughtful citizen should take any joy from the President's current troubles, but the pressing needs of the Nation's transportation system must take precedence over the White House's political dilemma.

Second, the bill is fiscally sound. The President is confused when he says this bill is a budget buster. The highway trust fund should be taken out of the budget, because it confuses many people and in this case it confused the President.

We should remember that highway construction is financed by a special trust fund that cannot be used for anything else. That fund is constantly fueled by gasoline taxes, and it is now almost \$10 billion in the black. The fund's surplus will probably expand in the years ahead under the moderate spending levels set by the bill.

Moreover, the demonstration projects that have been unjustly maligned as budget busters only make up about 1 percent of the total cost of the bill's projects. Clearly, the budget deficits are irrelevant to the consideration of this essential legislation.

In effect, the President is using the budgetary disaster created by his own administration to rationalize his veto of one of the most vital bills that will come before the Congress this year.

In addressing the question of whether the demonstration projects are necessary, let me cite the example of the bill's authorization for overpasses along a dangerous section of the U.S. 63 bypass in Jonesboro, AR. That project is designed to demonstrate how access control can improve safety for the thousands of motorists who travel the road daily.

I would like to invite the President to travel the major intersections of the U.S. 63 bypass in Jonesboro, if he would truly like to learn whether the project is needed. Anyone who has traveled those crowded, chaotic intersections knows that they are unsafe.

The intersections of the U.S. 63 bypass in Jonesboro have been the sites of many serious traffic accidents causing injury and death. To illustrate the imperative need for this project, consider the grisly record of accident statistics since the bypass opened in 1971: More than 1,500 accidents, 22 deaths, and more than 650 injuries along the dangerous 10-mile stretch of highway.

The bill would authorize \$12.3 million between the current fiscal year and fiscal 1991 for the project, with 80 percent of the total being supplied by Federal funds and 20 percent from the State. That is a tiny investment, when considered in the light of the need to reduce the number of accidents and save lives.

Another important example of the beneficial provisions of the bill is an authorization for States to use Federal bridge replacement funds to replace the four ferries in Arkansas with bridges. The ferries at Guion, Peel, Spring Bank, and Moro Bay, AR, are often unreliable, slow, and dangerous in bad weather.

The ferries often cause motorists to take long detours. For example, the Guion, AR, ferry is often out of service because of fluctuating water levels on the White River, sometimes causing motorists to drive about 40 miles out of their way when the ferry is not operating.

The Jonesboro overpasses and the Guion bridge are only two examples of the many beneficial projects that are included in this bill. Nationally, the bill authorizes roughly \$88 billion over 5 years for such essential projects as improvements in the secondary highway system in rural areas, interstate highway construction, mass transit, bridge repairs, and a variety of programs for eliminating hazards in many areas of the Nation's transportation network.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the many worthwhile projects included in the

bill, we should also consider the dire economic consequences that would flow from a failure to pass this bill in a timely fashion. If it is not passed soon, the construction season will likely be lost, and 800,000 jobs will vanish along with it. The construction industry would be disrupted and would fall into a recession, and that would inevitably have a ripple effect throughout the entire U.S. economy.

The administration has offered another version of the bill, but it would take time to get that version passed, and in the meantime the construction season would be lost.

Moreover, the administration's version cuts out many of the most meritorious projects in the bill, including the Jonesboro overpasses.

The administration's substitute unfairly singles out some States for substantial reductions in proposed funding. Arkansas would have its funding reduced by \$5 million under the substitute, a bigger reduction than any State in America with the exception of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has received widespread bipartisan support among Members of Congress, as it has passed the House and Senate by overwhelming margins. Many Republicans have supported it, because they know it is not a budget buster, but a fiscally sound, indispensable measure for improving America's highways.

Many of the bill's opponents have attempted to argue that a vote to override the veto would somehow tarnish the President's reputation for the remainder of his Presidency. That is simply not true. Members who vote for the override will be discharging their duty to judge each case on its own individual merits. Those of us who vote for the override could, with perfect logic, choose to support the President on future important issues if we feel that his position on those issues is correct. We are voting today on the specific issue of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987, and not upon some vague mandate for the President's political leadership.

The President has waged an intensive lobbying effort to sustain his veto, and his lieutenants have basically argued that unless he wins this one vote, he will be crippled for the remainder of his term. The impact of a defeat upon the President's power is irrelevant to the merits of this bill. The President should respect the right of Members of Congress to follow their independent judgment, especially in light of our own intimate knowledge of the transportation needs of our districts.

During this debate, far too much attention has been focused on the bogus question of whether the President wins or loses, as if this vote were some type of cosmic football game. Yet it is

not a sporting contest, but a deadly serious matter, and if the bill does not become law the true loser will be the national interest in a prosperous economy and a safe, effective system of transportation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, before us is an issue which may readily be resolved by the old, traditional political formula of what's in it for me. If we look very carefully at the legislation before us we find that the distribution of projects under the \$6 billion in question goes to a very few, limited number of projects. And if we take the example of the project being described as pork, the real question is did I wind up with the pork chop or the pig lips.

I think if we come to a conclusion that we wound up with the lips, they will outnumber the chops, and we would find the votes needed to sustain the veto of this measure. But these are not the real concerns before us.

What I am concerned about is the direction this legislation will ultimately lead, for I have heard discussions of many that we are going to ultimately raise gasoline taxes to fund the growing deficit, and that we cannot ignore that an increase of \$6 billion will weigh heavily on the American taxpayer.

No, Mr. Speaker, we are headed the wrong direction down a one-way street at 55 miles an hour. But we are going the wrong direction, and we are on a collision course with a large bus, Mr. Speaker, a bus which contains a number of taxpayers. And I have not seen a bus that cannot overrun a hog yet.

I think we have to watch. I think we have to be careful. The time to get off the road is now, and the stop is called veto.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], a member of the committee.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank our distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a lemon as described by the President of the United States on nationwide television. By voting yes to override this bill today, you will be making lemonade. Let me explain how.

We have heard a lot of talk today about the economics of this National Infrastructure Program, 800,000 jobs lost if the veto is not overridden. Those facts are all accurate.

Let me, as one who helped write the first Interstate Highway Act, who stood in the well 31 years ago with our beloved Speaker Mr. WRIGHT and Chairman DINGELL the only three sitting members on Public Works at the

time, talk a little bit about safety in my 2 minutes.

In 1955, with our small, antiquated roads, Mr. Speaker, we were killing about 38,000 people yearly. That climbed up 10 years later to where we were killing 50,000 people on the highways of this country in 1965. And as the Interstate System and our primary system got off of the little, antiquated, small, two-lane roads and went to our nice four-lane divided highways with access ramps and a center median, we cut down from 50,000 fatalities in 1966 to 47,000 in 1986, 20 years later.

We had at that time in 1956 when we passed this first bill, 50 million vehicles on the highways. Today, 1987, I want to say to the President that we have a 300-percent increase in motor vehicle users. Many of them large trucks. We are up to 150 million vehicles on the highways today.

But thank God for the Interstate Highway Act and our four-lane primary highways, and the safety features passed by this committee and this Congress of widening the bridges, and putting deflecting guardrails, painting reflectors so that we now, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, last year, in 1986, there were less than 46,000 people killed on the highways of America with a 300-percent increase in the use of motor vehicles from the first day I stood in this well, 31 years ago.

This is more than an economic bill. It is a safety bill. So I ask you, do you want to save lives? Do you want to improve America with millions of new jobs? Do you want easier and safer driving? If you do, turn that lemon into lemonade by voting aye to override this veto and finish our 42,500 miles Interstate System and other badly needed roads and mass transit projects. Thank you.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a valuable member of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I certainly congratulate the members of the committee, and particularly the leadership of the committee, for their hard work in bringing this bill back to us.

I simply would like to address a couple of points.

One, this bill has been carefully crafted over the last 2 or more years in an effort to meet all of the concerns of the transportation issues across the country.

In conference committee there has been a very tenuous and certainly a delicate series of concessions made in order to make it so that it is compatible to both bodies and to both sides of the aisle and to all States involved.



And the moment that we sustain this veto, all of those concessions and all of those efforts will be undone, and people will be released, and we will be back to where we were before we began this bill.

We will find ourselves literally taking the rest of this year, and we will be very fortunate if we are able to craft another bill that will be acceptable to the administration and still meet the criteria and the concerns of the committees. So we will lose valuable time, and we will certainly lose the momentum that many of the projects across the country already have.

Second, this is not a budget buster. We are talking about a piece of legislation that actually expends less money for highways than what the President had in his submitted budget a couple of months ago.

Third, it does not withdraw money from the general funds; it is not a budget issue. It is extracting money from the trust fund, and that is what we have been wanting to do for some time, is to draw those trust funds. Ironically, however, this bill will not draw down from the trust funds. Literally during the 5 years of this authorization there will be an increase in the surplus of the trust funds of \$1 billion, and so we are not actually depleting the money in the trust funds, at least the highway trust funds.

So this is not a budget buster. It is a piece of legislation that needs to pass. That means we need to override the President's veto.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, this is not to me a confrontation with the President, but for my State it is the cornerstone of our economic recovery and growth. Our people want to know one thing: Why is it that when they pay 9 cents for every gallon of gas they do not get their money back? They know that we are the third neediest State in terms of repairs. We know in Ohio that we are going to see 20,000 jobs permanently lost if we do not pass this bill.

Today in Cleveland there are 10 inches of snow. We are going to lose another construction season, and we will be even more lost in terms of our needs being fulfilled.

I want to say something about the so-called pork-barrel projects. I have a demonstration project in this bill. I am very happy that the chairman and the committees, in a bipartisan way, agreed to it. It is called the Eagle

Ramp. This ramp leads to 60 different industries. If you stand under the ramp, chunks of concrete will fall on you literally because it is in such ill repair.

□ 1420

Thousands of jobs will be lost if this ramp is permanently closed. So we feel very, very strongly that this is not a pork-barrel project; this is something very lean and mean. Please, override this veto for the sake of our Nation's economy and our national security.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto. I do so with great reluctance, and I am certain that many of my colleagues feel the same.

Certainly President Reagan has a strong record in support of a sound and efficient highway and transit program, and a vote to override should, in no way, detract from that record.

Yet, so much is at stake in the matter before us. To realize the gravity of the situation, we need only remember that March 20 signaled not only the beginning of spring, but the start of the highway construction season as well.

This means that efforts to enact highway legislation have taken on new and critical importance. Our failure to enact a bill now will mean the loss of about 800,000 construction-related jobs.

We must act now, because we cannot pick up and start over on a new bill and expect to get one out early. It is time that all of us—including the administration—take the key players in this matter at their word when they say we cannot do this again quickly.

The administration obviously feels that its alternative legislation could be swiftly accepted. Yet, far from simply changing the dollar figures for the programs, it is proposing 30 policy changes that could not possibly be dealt with in a short period of time. Many difficult months have been spent in reaching the most delicate of compromises, and were we to open up 30 issues. That compromise would quickly unravel.

The administration also keeps referring to the bill passed by Congress as a budget buster. This simply is not the case at all. We know that the 9-cent Federal gas tax provides the dedicated funding for this deficit-proof program. Our bill provides from the highway trust fund \$68.8 billion for the highway program, and that dollar amount is virtually identical to the \$68.5 billion proposed by the President for the same 5-year period.

Yet, the President now proposes that we cut the program to \$66 billion, which is \$2.5 billion under the proposal he made in January. We can only

conclude, therefore, that the administration is simply manufacturing this budget-busting issue.

As we approach this vote, we must realize that should we vote, to sustain and thus open up this bill, all of the controversial issues that so divided the House and Senate are back on the table, including the one-half-percent minimum funding for interstate construction; the 85-percent minimum allocation program; and changes in the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

On the speed limit issue, I know that Chairman JIM HOWARD has already received enough commitments to turn the previous vote around. Those who support increasing the limit to 65 miles per hour should be aware that if the issue comes before us again, the outcome could well be different.

All of the controversial issues aside, this bill is essentially about getting on with the job of improving our Nation's transportation system. Therefore, in the furtherance of that worthy goal, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to override.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2, and the need to override the President's veto of this vital legislation.

This weekend a distressed and unemployed construction worker said of course the President was vetoing the bill—it is creating American jobs. He was incensed the administration would sponsor recruiting sessions in Mexico for United States businesses, and then veto a program that supports American jobs, industries and the economy. I have received calls, letters and telegrams from a number of anxious construction company owners who are facing severe financial difficulties with expensive machinery sitting idle while the payments, insurance, and overhead continue uninterrupted.

No one doubts the President has the power and constitutional authority to veto legislation. The Founding Fathers stressed the importance of the separation of powers doctrine 200 years ago and every school child is taught this lesson in their first history and civics class. President Reagan does not have to jeopardize 800,000 American jobs to prove this point.

I urge my colleague in the House and our colleagues in the other body to vote to override this veto so we can proceed with the business of building America's highways and bridges.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]

for their leadership on this bill. I'd like to make several brief points.

First, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] earlier criticized demonstration projects on grounds that they hurt other States. I myself had problems with the earlier version of this bill because it did not adequately, in my judgment, handle the problem of the so-called minimum allocations States, the donor States. When such States, like Wisconsin, did not receive many demonstration projects. But this bill has been altered, happily so, to take care of that problem in the distribution formulas. Wisconsin, for example, will now receive \$73 million more as a result of this change. The demonstration problem has been substantially fixed in regard to what it does to the other States.

Second, the so-called problem of budget busting. If you agree that this bill is under the Gramm-Rudman deficit limit for fiscal year 1987, and if you agree that it is financed out of a segregated trust account, then to vote to not override—to sustain the President's veto—is in effect to vote to use the highway trust fund surpluses to balance the rest of the budget. I do not think anybody in this body would consciously want to use the highway surpluses to balance budgets spent in military or other areas.

Third, the lateness of the season. In Wisconsin, we have a specific problem: We are a cold winter State, and a short building season State, and we need this money to get those roads built now. Our State is borrowing money temporarily on a State basis to do so, but this cannot go on. One thousand jobs are at stake in Wisconsin, and I urge my colleagues from all the cold weather States, those initially worried about demonstration projects, and those worried about budget balances to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any of the Members who had requested time from the small allocation we have left on the floor; therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the veto in spite of the provision permitting many States to exceed the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Mr. Speaker, on March 18 the House considered the conference report to H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act of 1987. I voted against the motion to recommit and for passage of the conference report. I was present in the House Chamber at the time of the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 77, to permit the States to increase the speed limit from 55 miles per hour to

65 miles per hour on certain segments of the Interstate Highway System. I inserted my voting card in the electronic machine and believed that my vote against House Concurrent Resolution 77 had been recorded. Unfortunately, however, my vote on this question was not recorded on rollcall No. 35.

Respondents to a recent issue survey in my district supported maintaining the existing 55-mile-per-hour speed limit by a majority. In my view, the evidence is overwhelming that the current 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has saved hundreds of lives and reduced the number of severe injuries in automobile accidents. It has also resulted in less energy consumption and less American dependence upon foreign oil imports. These points are well understood by my constituents.

The argument that so many people are ignoring the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and that therefore we should raise the limit for that reason is unpersuasive and illogical. I do not believe that it is in the best interests of either the Federal Government or the States for Congress to periodically adjust the permissible speed limits on interstate highways to suit the political passions of the moment. I would hope that we can maintain some consistency in this issue with due regard for the prerogatives of the States as well.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has portrayed this legislation as being characterized by excessive spending when in fact it authorizes for appropriation and entitlement formula nearly \$1 billion less each of the 5 years 1987-92 for highway and transit purposes than expended in the most recent 5-year authorization, 1981-86.

While the measure earmarks specific projects in some Member's districts, not all of which I favor, the administration is requesting the discretion to be exercised solely within its prerogative on these same dollars. In fact the administration now controls at least three times the cumulative value of these projects in dollar amounts under the provisions of this measure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, recognizing the inherent compromise and need to facilitate the construction activities in an urgent manner, I urge a positive vote by the House.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the House of Representatives and the Senate recently approved the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act of 1987. Support in both Chambers was overwhelming, evidence that this legislation is of paramount concern to the Congress and to the entire Nation as well. Unfortunately, the administration does not share this perspective.

Contrary to many accounts by the administration, this is not pork-barrel legislation. H.R. 2 is a very legitimate measure, designed to serve America's ever-growing transportation needs. It is important to note that this bill will

not increase the Federal deficit. The programs covered by the Surface Transportation Act are financed by trust funds. With the spring construction period about to begin, it is imperative that this bill be enacted immediately. Without the reauthorization of highway programs, New York State alone will face the delay of over 150 projects, worth more than \$600 million, resulting in the loss of more than 16,000 jobs set for this year's building season.

Nassau County, NY, contains perhaps the Nation's largest commuting population. Several projects important to Long Islanders are funded under this Federal Highway Program. These include construction of the 1.3-mile Nassau Expressway in Hempstead, improvements to Sunrise Highway, and the addition of the fourth lane to the Long Island Expressway [LIE]. This improvement to the LIE will help relieve traffic congestion on one of the Nation's most heavily traveled roadways.

I voted in favor of this legislation on two previous occasions, and I supported passage of the conference report. It is indeed unfortunate that the administration has chosen this late date to request a negative vote, in the form of sustaining the veto, on the measure. I cannot support this request.

It is the urgency of the situation that causes me to alert my colleagues of the disastrous impact that this veto creates. America needs this measure to insure its transportation and safety needs. I request the House consider this matter with the utmost concern and render a decision favorable to this Nation's commuters.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Act. We are all about to be faced with voting to sustain or override the President's veto of this highly controversial highway bill. It's a difficult decision for many of us to make, but no one said this job would be fun.

When you are caught in a bind between getting much needed funds for highway projects to your State and trying to balance the Federal budget, what do you do? Colorado's highways and bridges are in sad shape and Congress failed to appropriate the expected funds in the fall of 1986. The situation grows more desperate with each passing day and pressure builds from contractors, State highway departments, cities, and counties to get a highway bill out of Congress.

Therefore, 2 weeks ago we passed an \$87.5 billion highway bill which was heavily supported by Congress. The fact that the bill was generously laced with unjustified pork didn't deter us since most felt this was all we were going to get and we needed to have the money flowing in time to take advantage of the warm weather construction season.

Now the President vetoes the bill. This demonstrates an amazing amount of courage in light of the pressure on him to sign it. Courage is a rare commodity in our Nation's Capital. I always thought that Congress was hired to make the tough decisions but it appears that Congress doesn't make decisions between competing priorities. It simply votes for everything because to vote against a spending measure might get someone in your district mad at you.



Therefore, if we are ever to balance the budget, the President needs to utilize the veto as a weapon and we need to back him up. In this way, maybe Congress can learn to have backbone and discipline.

The President favors a fiscally responsible Federal-aid highway and transit program as well as provisions that would allow States to raise their speed limits on rural interstate highways to 65 miles per hour. However, this bill's excessive mass transit authorization levels, coupled with numerous individual special interest highway and transit construction projects, and its unfair distributions of transit funds to relatively few cities have forced the President to veto the bill.

In Colorado, we would get \$185 million in highway funds which is \$24 million less than we received in 1986. How can we spend almost \$19 billion on urban mass transit around the Nation, at a time when our highways and bridges are suffering? I don't want to build a subway for Los Angeles while Colorado's funds are being cut back.

In a meeting last week with Republican Members of Congress, the President indicated he will veto every budget-busting bill we send him and he asked for our support in controlling the spending. He said Congress has traditionally had three creative ideas—"tax, tax, tax," which leads to "spend, spend, spend," which makes the deficit go "up, up, up." He asked us to say "no, no, no."

This bill also sets a very dangerous precedent for future transportation and budget policy. It would expend the role of the Federal Government as overseer of national highways and mass transit by mandating which local programs States must undertake rather than leaving this decision up to the individual States. In addition, the spending provisions of H.R. 2 suggest that many in Congress have absolutely no intention of meeting the targets mandated by Gramm-Rudman.

The President is right to criticize this highway bill. It should not be passed in its present form. But a highway bill should be passed, and soon. Congress must not drag its feet any longer on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to explain my vote on the override of the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act. With great reluctance and profound regret, I was forced to oppose the President and vote to override his veto.

Clearly, a highway reauthorization bill is vitally important. It is estimated that to restore and build America's infrastructure network—the roads and bridges, water and sewer systems, and other public works necessary for economic development and the public's health and safety—it will cost approximately \$3 trillion over the next 20 years. Measured in constant dollars, spending in this area has declined 21 percent since 1965.

Without a highway bill, \$25 million worth of safety-related highway projects in my congressional district will not be let by the Florida Department of Transportation. These proposed improvements are not pork-barrel projects, but safety programs to add lanes and resurface existing highways in Palm Beach County, FL.

With one of the fastest growing congressional districts in the Nation whose transporta-

tion needs are seriously lagging, I am firmly dedicated to the improvement of roads. Although a tough decision, when I thought about the needless fatalities which have and would undoubtedly occur on U.S. Highway 27, the Bee Line Highway, and U.S. Highway 441 without a highway bill, I could not vote in good conscience to sustain President Reagan's veto.

For the safety to the automobile traveling public in Palm Beach County, it is imperative that these highway projects which have already been delayed 6 months, move swiftly forward now.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the override of the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act.

The action taken by the President is typical of his narrow view of the role of the Federal Government. The development and upkeep of this Nation's infrastructure is one of the most important responsibilities we have. A recent study found that over 15 percent of this Nation's highway system was in need of immediate repair. The preservation of these roads is vital to the commerce of the United States. The costs that would be incurred for repair to vehicles and delays because of these neglected roads would certainly be far greater than the investment which we are making at this time.

The President's opposition to H.R. 2 with regard to mass transportation is just as shortsighted. It is clearly in the national interest to support our cities' efforts to provide an efficient alternative to the vehicle which will reduce the strain on their roads. Our cities are the hub of this Nation's commerce system. It is vital to the whole Nation that our cities' transportation systems are efficient and dependable. To argue that mass transit is a parochial matter misses the point. This country's economy is based in its metropolises. To neglect their needs would be to cut off our toe to spite our foot.

The President's opposition would warrant some merit if this bill did anything to increase the strain on our resources during this time of budgetary crisis. But H.R. 2 does not add to this Nation's deficit. Eighty-seven percent of the total funding authorized by this bill comes from highway trust fund revenues. This fund, supported through the gasoline tax, was established for the expressed purpose of what we are doing now, building and repairing this Nation's infrastructure. The administration, as it is wont to do, would like to bend the rules and use the money which was collected for a very specific purpose to support its own objectives. That would be against both the letter and the intent of the law. This money was intended for roads. It should be used that way.

Moreover, this bill is a jobs bill. It will support over 800,000 workers at a time when unemployment in the construction industry stands at 12.5 percent. The administration argues that it is not the Federal Government's role to create jobs. Would President Reagan rather we abrogate our responsibility to protect something as vital to our national security as our Interstate Highway System and put it completely in the hands of the private sector? I hope not.

In conclusion I would like to note that Congress has shown a great deal of responsibility

in crafting this legislation. It would be a shame to let all of this good work go to waste, not only for us, but for every American who depends on this Nation's roads and mass transit.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of sustaining the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. While I believe that a fiscally responsible highway/transit reauthorization bill is an essential item for the Nation, I support the President's resolve to resist budget-busting legislation that contains excessive spending, deepens the Federal budget deficit and provide the opportunity for some in Congress to increase taxes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2 exceeds the President's budget request by \$10.1 billion. H.R. 2 mandates an unprecedented 152 "demonstration" projects with nearly \$900 million of \$1.4 billion in authorized funding outside of budget controls. Furthermore, because this level of funding is inadequate to see these projects through to completion, the bill serves to create a need for significant additional spending in future years. Similarly, H.R. 2 contains a mass transit authorization of approximately \$18 billion which is twice what the administration requested. Very questionable rail projects in such cities as Miami and Los Angeles are in line for additional funding commitments from the Federal taxpayers. I also object to the "buy America" provisions in the bill which are harmful to U.S. trading interests.

It is argued that, inasmuch as the bill primarily deals with trust funds from the Federal gasoline tax, we should not be as concerned as with money from the general fund. I strongly disagree. The gasoline tax is a tax; those who pay should have the same right to have their taxes spent prudently.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is struggling to reduce annual Federal budget deficits and finding it extremely difficult to achieve the savings necessary to meet the deficit targets established in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, it is essential that a more effective job be done of restraining spending than that evidenced in H.R. 2. I encourage my colleagues to read the March 24, 1987, editorial in the Wall Street Journal on H.R. 2 and vote to sustain the President's veto.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1987]

#### HIGHWAY ROBBERY

"We have a bill out here . . . [that has] page after page after page after page after page of pork." Rep. Robert Walker, the Pennsylvania Republican, was describing the five-year, \$88 billion highway authorization bill now awaiting President Reagan's signature. Mr. Reagan is expected to veto the bill when it crosses his desk this week.

Just before the Senate voted on the bill last Friday, the President warned: "Congress can't have it both ways. They can't talk about cutting unnecessary deficit spending and then vote in favor of bills that bust the budget. The highway bill is a textbook example of how Congress talks deficit-tough, then votes like a soft touch."

The administration had no problems with the \$70 billion authorized for the federal highway program. These funds are apportioned to the states by a formula and used for building or repairing highways and

bridges. Congress adjourned without passing a highway bill last term, so many states are running low of funds in some categories.

The Highway Users Federation projects that half the states will soon deplete their funds for interstate highway construction; half will run short of money for interstate repair and resurfacing (a separate category); more than three-quarters will lack sufficient funds for upkeep of the primary highway system, which feeds into the interstate, and one-third will have to stall replacement and rehabilitation of bridges.

In a sense this is a "must pass" bill. And today that automatically makes it a convenient vehicle for pork-seeking congressmen. So the bill authorizes an additional \$900 million over five years for 152 highway "demonstration projects." The administration had proposed that these kinds of projects be included in the larger highway program; it would have brought them under the annual spending ceiling and required state or local matching funds. These conferees wrote the idea out of the bill.

The bill's \$18 billion mass-transit authorization is twice what the administration requested. Questionable rail projects in such cities as Miami—which, at last check was attracting less than 5% of potential riders in Dade County—are in line for full funding commitments from federal taxpayers. The administration argues that it's unfair for cities—accounting for only 20% of the population—to receive 80% of mass-transit dollars.

Another item in the highway bill would permit Massachusetts to build a third Boston harbor tunnel and to reconstruct the central artery of I-90 as an underground highway instead of an elevated highway. This expensive undertaking will require a revision of the formula used to distribute interstate highway funds, apportioning a significantly larger share for Massachusetts.

Last year the members of Congress tacked so many costly superfluous amendments to the bill that it collapsed. The same thing is happening this term. Back through the years when no one complained much about profligate federal spending, members of Congress just packed in the pork and burped their way to reelection year after year. We wonder whether the states aren't getting a little sick of the Washington politics of highway bills, which lately only guarantee that the states won't receive much-needed highway dollars any time soon. If the President vetoes this spending fiasco, perhaps the members should hold the pork and just pass the bill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, when the highway bill last came before the House, I voted to recommend it to the conference committee so that some of the fat could be trimmed. That battle was lost as the free spenders voted to keep all the pet pork projects that so heavily weigh down this important bill. Because of the necessity of funding the really needed highway and transit programs, after there was no other way to reduce its cost, I voted for the bill to keep it moving and to indicate my support for its provisions to raise the speed limit to 65. We now have an opportunity to reconsider the bill, and I must vote to support President Reagan's veto in a second effort to improve the bill and get at some of the fat.

Not all of the funds in this bill come from the highway trust fund; there are also significant general funds which are authorized, including \$11.5 billion for mass transit grants. The administration's alternative would de-

crease the amount of transit funding coming from the general fund, and increase the amount coming from the Mass Transit Account of the highway trust fund.

The administration's plan would also address the inequities in the way the mass transit funds are distributed. One such inequity under the conference agreement, for example, is that the Los Angeles Metrolink project would consume a full 14 percent of the highway fund's mass transit account, even though the city has not even decided where to put it. The environmental review process is not even complete.

The administration has also rightly objected to the 152 demonstration projects in the bill which have not been selected through the established Federal-aid Highway Program procedures.

The administration's alternative bill cuts the pork, and provides for a more even distribution of funding among the States. It would eliminate funding for the demonstration projects, and it puts more money into formula programs. Despite its lower overall cost to the American taxpayer, many States, including Arizona, would come out ahead under the administration's proposal. Arizona gains \$1 million under the President's plan for the transit program and \$5 million for the highway program.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at some of the rhetoric we have been hearing about this legislation—that if we do not override the President's veto, we will throw the economy into recession. There is no good reason why we can't pass a bill acceptable to the President and have it on his desk in a matter of days. The Democratic leadership controls the agenda in both Chambers. All the Democratic leadership has to do is allow the President's alternative—or something close to it—to reach the floor. If they don't, there is no one else to blame. I cannot believe they would be so irresponsible, so petulant, as to refuse to quickly submit a less costly alternative.

The conference agreement clearly can be improved. At the same time, many of the provisions, like the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit, should be retained. I don't particularly appreciate some of my eastern colleagues holding the 65-mile-per-hour provision hostage in order to gain support for the override of the pork bill. Because of their threat, there is a risk that the 65-mile-per-hour provision will not be included in a subsequent highway funding bill. But paying a ransom of billions of dollars in Government waste just to secure the 65-mile-per-hour provision while we are faced with reducing the tremendous Federal budget deficit is not the answer. Moreover, 65 should not be the final word on speed limits. The real answer is to get the Federal Government out of the business of setting speed limits altogether, and return that authority to the States where it rightfully belongs. Even if adopted, we should not be satisfied with the speed-limit provisions of the bill, which should be viewed as only an interim measure at best.

For all these reasons, I hope the House will sustain the President's veto. The American taxpayers deserve it.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House of Representatives passed the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assist-

ance Act by a vote of 407 to 17. The Senate followed suit and agreed to H.R. 2 by an overwhelming vote of 79 to 17. President Reagan vetoed this bill because he claimed it was a budget buster. This is not true. The numbers in this 5-year bill are below the budget figures set by the House and Senate Budget Committees, as well below previous funding levels in 1985 and 1986. In January, the Reagan administration proposed a highway program that would cost \$68.5 billion for 5 years. At \$68.8 billion, H.R. 2 is almost identical to the administration's target. Furthermore, the President claimed that H.R. 2 is "filled with pork," yet, the demonstration projects he is referring to amount to less than 1 percent of the whole bill.

As we all well knew, this bill is critical to our Nation's transportation needs. If H.R. 2 is not approved by tomorrow, each State must cease awarding highway construction contracts. To the United States, this means a loss of almost \$17 billion in construction funds and 800,000 jobs. To the State of California, this means that \$500 million in State and local road projects will be unnecessarily delayed thereby incurring \$50 million in additional costs. Also, over 22,000 full-time jobs statewide are at stake. Moreover, business and sales revenue generated by the State and local construction programs could drop by as much as \$1.1 billion in 1987 and 1988.

The 5-year reauthorization bill, funds a number of Federal highway projects. In my home State, H.R. 2 provides for \$1.6 billion in Federal funds to complete California's remaining interstate highway. And, in my district, H.R. 2 funds five projects including a \$10.8 million project to construct a four-lane-expressway on Route 99/77 in Sacramento County. In the city of Vacaville, H.R. 2 provides for a \$2.3 million project which would widen the Alamo Drive overcrossing on Interstate 80 from two lanes to four lanes. In addition, the bill includes two projects in Fairfield totaling \$75 million. Reconstruction of Holiday Lane from Oliver Lane to Travis Boulevard is planned as well as reconstructing East Tabur Avenue from North Texas to Dover.

H.R. 2 authorizes \$68 billion nationwide for highways and \$21 billion for mass transit over 5 years. California is slated to receive \$5.5 billion over the same period of time. On behalf of the businesses and constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of California, I urge this body to override President Reagan's veto of H.R. 2.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. I do so reluctantly because I have a great respect for President Reagan. However, he got some bad advice on this bill and his veto is just plain wrong.

This highway bill is not a budget buster. The average funding level of \$13.6 billion a year for highways in the conference report is \$1.3 billion less than we spent in fiscal year 1985. It is \$1.7 billion less than the original 1986 funding level and it is even \$1.1 billion less than the 1986 funding level after the Gramm-Rudman cuts.



That is an 11-percent cut from the 1986 level and a 7.5-percent cut from the 1986 funding levels after they were Gramm-Rudmaned. No one can call that busting the budget.

In fact, if we applied a similar 7.5-percent cut across the board on the entire Federal budget, we would easily meet the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction target of \$108 billion this year.

There is also the fact that the money that comes into the highway trust fund from the gasoline taxes is raised for the express purpose of constructing and maintaining our Nation's highways and transportation systems. That is all it can be spent for. It can't be spent for anything else and it certainly shouldn't be held on ice just to make the deficit look better on paper.

This bill keeps faith with the American motorist. We promised to use the taxes raised from gasoline sales to keep the roads in good shape and this bill does just that. It does it prudently. It does it well and it does it in a fiscally responsible manner. There is no deficit in the highway trust fund.

Of course, much to-do has been made about the demonstration projects in this bill. They are referred to as pork barrel projects. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have one of those demonstration projects in my district. I'm here to tell you that it is a good project. It's true that it was not high on the State's priority list but it's a good project and will mean a great deal to the economic development of the northern part of my district.

It's not pork and it's not boondoggle.

But regardless of the merits of this one demonstration project or any of them, it is important to keep in mind that these demonstration projects account for only 2 percent of the highway funds made available under this bill. The whole issue has been blown out of proportion. Calling this a pork barrel bill is like calling a strip of bacon a lard.

This bill means a lot to my district, my State, and the Nation. We cannot afford any more delay. There are six highway projects with a price tag of \$6,712,000 in northern Kentucky awaiting passage of this bill. There are another 16 projects in Jefferson County, costing over \$41 million, awaiting passage of this bill.

This bill is not a budget buster and it is not a pork barrel and it should be enacted.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. When President Reagan vetoed the Surface Transportation Act of 1987, he killed a major piece of legislation which has been anxiously awaited by virtually every State in the Union, which have had to put their highway construction and repair on hold while they waited for funds. The delay in funding would likely result in a loss in the 1987 construction season and in nearly 5,000 jobs in my State of Utah.

The highway bill is great news for Utah. By encouraging the conference committee to retain the 4R formula, which provides the money for maintenance and repair of the highways, we were able to give the States the right to raise the speed limit on rural highways. But most importantly, it meant that Utah would receive \$74.2 million in funds to put people back to work on our highways in Utah.

On balance, Utah definitely comes off a big winner in the 1987 highway bill.

Unfortunately, the administration has chosen to hold up this much needed money in an attempt to flex its political muscle and save its image. The administration has called the bill a lemon and a budget buster, but has been hard pressed to come up with any specific complaints against the bill. They claim that the bill is too costly, and yet the figure, \$87.5 billion over the next 5 years, falls within the budget targets, and is about \$1 billion per year below last year's Gramm-Rudman-Hollings figure. Even more importantly, 87 percent of the money comes from the highway trust fund. This money cannot be spent on anything but highway and mass transit programs.

The bill will create 800,000 jobs over the next 5 years, almost 5,000 in Utah. These are construction jobs, which do not include the jobs that will be created because of a more efficient highway system. And that is 800,000 jobs that the President is willing to jeopardize in order, in the words of Senator BOB DOLE, to "show that he is tough." These jobs will provide \$195 million in consumer spending in the State of Utah alone, helping our local businesses and industries.

President Reagan complains that the highway is full of pork, referring to the demonstration projects to help correct specific, localized problems. There are, perhaps, more of these projects than I would have written in, but it is important to keep them in perspective. The moneys for the demonstration projects represents barely 1 percent of the total. For 1 percent of the bill, and in an attempt to show that they are still in control, the administration is willing to risk millions of Utah dollars, and thousands of Utah jobs. I trust that the House of Representatives is not willing to take the same risk.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, every vote to override a Presidential veto is a source of some discomfort to many of us. The veto is often a threat, but seldom put to actual use. No President casts a veto lightly.

On this particular veto of the highway bill, the President's objections are serious, and I take them seriously. The bill is too expensive in a time of persistent deficits. On his overspending point, he is dead right.

For me the squeeze comes because my State has a rather short highway building and repair season. If the interstate construction estimates are not ratified, promptly, my State could lose an entire construction season. Neither our transportation system, nor our construction firms, nor their employees can stand the loss of a season.

My choice, then, is to vote for an unnecessary expensive bill, or to allow my State to absorb unnecessary economic loss. Often it is no fun to be a Member of Congress. Today is one of those times. I shall vote for my State's economic interest when I regretfully vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the President has decided to flex his political muscle on the backs of American workers and transit users who have waited patiently for Congress to enact Federal highway legislation.

As a member of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, I

know just how hard the House and Senate conferees have worked to bring this measure to a final vote. Unfortunately, the Surface Transportation Act has fallen victim to the usual charges of high expenditures and special projects. If I could comment, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, on the charge that this bill is merely pork barrel legislation. First, the demonstration projects are designed to meet real transportation concerns around the country. Second, the total amount spent on these projects amounts to only 1 percent of the amount authorized in the bill.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should be more concerned about the state of the Nation's Interstate and Transit Systems than whether or not the President can demonstrate leadership. I would urge my colleagues to remember the impact that further delays will have on our constituencies: construction jobs will continue to be delayed, leaving many workers without employment; transit infrastructure will remain in disrepair; and the Nation's highway and bridge systems will continue to deteriorate.

Hopefully, the Congress will not let politics stand in the way of what is right: enacting the Surface Transportation Act now. I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we must override the President's veto of the highway-transit reauthorization bill, which contains \$72 million and affects 1,875 jobs for west Texas and the greater El Paso area.

The State of Texas will receive about \$847 million in highway funds over 3 years under this legislation, and the El Paso area is scheduled for \$42 million. The President's veto of the bill threatens this funding, which will support 1,800 highway jobs in my community. I represent a region whose economic future is tied to an interdependent and fragile border economy, and we can ill afford an economic blow of this magnitude.

The legislation also contains \$30 million in operating subsidies and supports 75 transit-related jobs for the Sun City Area Transit [SCAT], which serves 9,750,000 passengers each year. Without this essential Federal assistance, local officials would be forced to either take that \$30 million from other programs or raise it through taxes, and I don't think they should have to make that kind of decision. The city of El Paso has already risked its credit rating by raising \$15 million from a bond issue, and the defeat of this highway bill would leave them high and dry. Unfortunately, the administration just does not believe in mass transit assistance to local governments, regardless of how important it is to communities like El Paso, and the President's veto was based partially on this consideration.

In terms of specific local projects, the President vetoed the \$7 million rehabilitation project for the Cotton Street Bridge and the \$33 million Loop 375 extension around Fort Bliss, which are critical to El Paso's economic development. Traffic congestion is acute in these areas, and in the case of the Cotton Street Bridge, the infrastructure is in such dire need of repair that trucks are no longer able to use it, thus creating additional bottlenecks for the flow of goods and commerce.

Another essential feature of this legislation is the requirement that at least 85 cents out of every dollar paid to the Federal highway trust fund be returned to the State that provided that dollar.

Prior to the enactment of this provision, Northeastern States such as New York and New Jersey were getting far more than their fair share, while larger States such as Texas were receiving far less from the Federal Government than the amount they had contributed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to override this veto. My position is not based upon anything other than the sincere belief that this legislation is good for west Texas and good for our interdependent border economy. I agree with the need to strengthen the Presidency and restore the stature of that great Office, but vetoing essential legislation and costing El Paso \$75 million and 1,875 jobs is not the way to do it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the choice we have to make today is rather simple: Do we want a highway program for 1987 or don't we? If we in Congress fail to override President Reagan's ill-advised veto, our States stand to lose an entire construction season. Think of the thousands of jobs that will be lost in the construction industry. Think of the misery that will be inflicted upon 800,000 families who will be the victims of our action today.

What are our alternatives? The administration would like us to abandon a piece of carefully crafted legislation that represents months of bipartisan negotiation and compromise and to accept its version of a highway bill. Has anyone here had the time to even look at this proposal, which was delivered to Capitol Hill Friday afternoon at 5 p.m.? Did the President's messenger have trouble getting the document to the Hill because of all the potholes on the roads? Was he stuck in traffic on some road dying for repair? I can't help but think that if this bill was intended to construct roads leading to the Contra training camps it would stand a better chance of Presidential approval.

President Reagan indicated in his veto message that he has four major objections to the highway bill. If that is the case, why in fact does his bill call for approximately 30 policy changes in this country's transportation program? It defies any kind of reason that the Congress could responsibly act on such a proposal within a matter of days, or for that matter, even before this year's construction season is lost. So in the meantime, how about those potholes?

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the notion to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act.

Simply put, the Presidential veto of this vital highway and mass transit improvement measure was ill-advised. The President justified his action by statements about the excessive and wasteful spending authorized by this bill for projects he and his advisers do not think are necessary. But, let's examine the true facts about this bill.

Granted, this bill does provide a total of approximately \$87.9 billion in Federal spending over the next 5 fiscal years, but it's money well spent. We're talking about money for

highway safety improvement. We're talking about money for repairing dangerously old and deteriorating bridges. We're talking about money for building new roads and making the old ones safer. We're talking about money for thousands of jobs that desperately need doing.

There is another major flaw in the decision to veto this measure due to cost considerations. Eighty-seven percent of the total funding authorized by this bill comes from the highway trust fund, which is made up of Federal gasoline tax revenue and other user taxes and accumulate at a rate of about \$1 billion per month. The highway trust fund revenues cannot be used for anything but highway and mass transit programs. So, we really only have two choices. Either we spend highway trust fund dollars for the purposes they are intended, as proposed in H.R. 2; or we let those dollars sit unused while our Nation's highway and mass transit systems deteriorate to dangerous levels.

Mr. Speaker, the decision we must make today is an obvious one. We must override the President's veto. However, I would concede that the President was correct in raising the cost issue surrounding this bill. There is, indeed, a very high price tag associated with this bill—if it is not enacted. Nationwide, some 5,000 highway projects valued at an estimated \$8.2 billion would be lost for this construction season, resulting in the loss of more than 800,000 construction jobs.

In my home State of New York, over 150 highway projects valued at more than \$600 million would have to be delayed, meaning the loss of an estimated 16,000 jobs. In addition, there would be similar losses in the State's transit construction program.

Perhaps the cost issue surrounding this bill was best stated by the mayor of New York City, Ed Koch, in a letter he sent to President Reagan urging him to approve this legislation. In that letter, he said:

For New York City your veto will mean a disruption of critical programs to rebuild local bridges and streets and to revitalize our mass transit system. Specifically, this will result in the loss of an entire construction season, as well as an estimated 1,500 jobs in the local construction industry, decay of our infrastructure, increased maintenance costs, and a severe decline in the service reliability of New York City's mass transit system—a system which is the sole means of transportation for millions of citizens.

These are the costs associated with this bill that I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker. And, it heartens me to know that all of these costs can be avoided if we vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2. I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting to override, and in so doing, to save thousands of jobs in an industry with an unemployment rate of 12.5 percent; and to save billions of dollars in much needed highway and mass transit improvement projects.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I regret in many ways the vote I'm going to cast today. I support some of the highway and transit programs. I understand the function of the highway trust fund derived from the gasoline tax. I also strongly support a change in the national maximum speed limit law so that States may

raise their speed limits on rural interstate highways up to a maximum of 65 miles per hour. But the bill is fundamentally flawed in its structure, and I agree with President Reagan that the American people shouldn't be forced to swallow bad medicine just because there's a good deal of sugar mixed in.

Much has been made of threats by committee members that 800,000 jobs would be lost without passage of this bill. Where was that threat 6 months ago when we adjourned without taking up final consideration of the highway bill? The delay we've suffered is not President Reagan's fault. Congress can attempt to lay that blame on the President's doorstep, just as they attempt to lay the blame for the budget deficit on the President's doorstep. But when we had the bill in front of us—why wasn't action taken before to avoid this circumstance?

This bill contains 152 separate demonstration projects which have been requested by various Members from various districts. The cost of these construction projects is sure to expand well beyond current estimates. And the inclusion of these projects falls well outside the successful effort of State-Federal highway program cooperation. Often, when projects are of little merit, or low priority, State entities will not request that they be funded by the Federal Government. This is a reality born of finite fiscal resources. You don't build what you can't afford.

But Congress doesn't understand the meaning of the word finite. They look at the trust fund, and they see unspent money, and without looking toward tomorrow, without regard to priority and merit, we authorize these demonstration projects. To the States and contractors who benefit from these projects, it's manna from heaven. Without it, they continue their most urgently needed projects to provide the basic services their constituents expect from the Federal, State, and local governments. So isn't it time we reject "business as usual" and get back to basics on Federal highway programs?

Basics don't include huge allocations for the Los Angeles Metrolink above the beyond what current planning can utilize. And the basics certainly don't include expansion of the Boston interstate projects by nearly \$1.1 billion.

President Reagan, in his veto message, has offered an alternative highway bill—without the add-ons, without the demonstration projects, and without unneeded bells and whistles. The distinguished members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee know their highway and transit bills inside out and backwards. They are highly skilled, highly intelligent individuals. I have the utmost faith that, given the real need for passage of a responsible highway bill, the members of the committee can come forward with a reasonable bill in rapid fashion that incorporates some of the good ideas proposed by the President.

As the Washington Post urged in its editorial on Sunday:

Congress should uphold the veto, take a good, quick look at the President's alternative proposal and come up with a sensible compromise that could keep things going for now and provide time for fundamental



improvements in the Federal highway program before a next round can begin.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should not be held hostage and forced to accept an unsound bill. Let's do the responsible, the reasonable thing, and sustain the President's veto and get back to basics in our highway programs.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act. This action by the President was detrimental to the many highway programs in Maryland's First Congressional District, directly involving the safety of our citizens that travel these poorly maintained roads and freeways.

Congress last passed a program authorizing funds for our highways in 1982, setting funding levels through 1986. The 99th Congress adjourned without approving a new multiyear reauthorization, with the exception of the Interstate Construction Program, thereby allowing all highway and transit program authorizations to expire on September 30, 1986. By overriding the President's veto, we will ensure proper authorizations for our Nation's transportation needs by providing \$13.9 billion annually through 1991 for construction and reconstruction of the interstate and secondary road projects in our country.

Just drive through southern Maryland and sit in the traffic, or drive around in Maryland's Eastern Shore and see the run-down bridges and roads—only then will you see why we need this bill so badly. As Congressman for Maryland's First District, I travel over 100,000 miles a year, witnessing firsthand the deteriorating conditions of our roads and highways. H.R. 2 is first and foremost a piece of legislation that will authorize spending from the highway trust fund for highway construction and repair, thereby correcting many of the poor driving conditions and safety hazards I have personally encountered on Maryland's highways.

President Reagan has accused this bill of being too excessive in its spending—I do not agree. Both in real dollar terms and in constant dollar value, the funding has declined—and will decline further with the enactment of this legislation. In fact, by its very nature, the Federal Highway Program cannot be labeled as a "budget buster." The program is financed by the self supporting Federal highway trust fund, which cannot exceed available funds. An overall decrease of 9 percent is expected in fiscal year 1987 from fiscal year 1986 under the provisions of the bill.

We will be taking a very responsible position that will save hundreds of thousands of jobs in the construction industry as well as preventing a highway crisis by taking action on this urgent matter today. Let's take a look at what this bill means to Maryland's First Congressional District.

Under H.R. 2, Calvert County will be allotted a total of \$10.9 million in highway projects. Maryland Route 2 will have two projects: the Johnson Bridge to Route 497 will receive \$5.5 million and route 497 to Parren Road will receive \$5.4 million. Caroline County will be allocated \$3.7 million for construction of the Maryland 404 Denton Bypass.

Cecil County will be receiving \$20.6 million in six major projects. Maryland Route 213 will

be allocated Federal aid for the renovation of two bridges: the Sassafras River Bridge will get \$1.1 million and \$6.6 million will go to the Bohemia River Bridge. The Amtrack line bridges will be refurbished at three locations: \$4 million will go to the Maryland Route 213 Bridge, \$3.2 million will go to the Maryland Route 268 Bridge, and \$4 million will go to the bridge at Maryland Route 268. The U.S. Route 222 Bridge will receive \$1.8 million.

With \$84.1 million, the total highway funds allotted to Queen Anne's County is the largest share in the First Congressional District. U.S. Route 50, west of Cox Creek to the intersection of Route 301, is expected to receive \$33.6 million while the Kent Narrows Bridge project has been selected to receive \$43.8 million. Two other projects are also slated to receive substantial amounts of money in the proposed legislation. The Chester River Bridge restoration project will receive \$4 million and Maryland Route 838 at Wye Island Road Bridge will be allotted the remaining \$2.7 million.

Harford County will receive a hefty \$30.2 million allotment divided amongst several locations: \$15 million to Maryland Route 24 between I-95 and U.S. 1; \$5 million to Maryland Route 22 from Shamrock to I-95; \$1.1 million to Maryland Route 23 at the Deer Creek Bridge; \$11.6 million to Maryland Route 543 at the I-95 interchange; and \$1 million to Maryland Route 755 at the Winner's Run Bridge.

Residents of Wicomico County will be assured of a major highway renovation as money awarded it under this bill totals \$71.4 million. U.S. Route 50 will have \$67 million in construction and reconstruction grants at the Vienna Bypass. Another \$1.5 million will be spent on Maryland Route 313 at the Sharptown Bypass. A final \$2.7 million will be directed to upgrade the Sharptown Bridge on Maryland Route 313.

Kent County will garner \$4.5 million of the highway funds made available by H.R. 2. The Chester River Bridge on Maryland Route 213 will receive \$4.3 million and another \$2 million will go to Cross Street on Maryland Route 289.

Somerset County has been awarded \$6.9 million to refurbish its roads. Of that sum, \$6.8 million will be spent upscaling Maryland Route 363 at Upper Thomas Road. The remainder will be directed to Maryland Route 363 from Hollis Corner to Crisfield Lane.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the 100th Congress by voting overwhelmingly to override the President's veto.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a few points in the closing of debate on this vital issue.

No. 1, immediate passage of this highway bill, and having it go into law is vital for the economy of this Nation. We have spoken about over 800,000 jobs being involved in this, and also the importance to the construction industry. We talk about the fact that we have roughly a 7 percent or so unemployment in this Nation. The construction industry unemployment at this time is 16.7 percent, and so it is vital that we do pass this bill because, should we not, it would be impossible

for the House and the Senate and a conference committee to pass other legislation in order to save any part of this construction season.

The great bulk of this bill, almost all of it, is dedicated user fees, or as I like to call them, benefitter fees. When you buy gasoline, a certain amount of that goes to the highway trust fund. The more you drive the more you pay; the less you drive the less you pay; if you do not drive, you do not pay at all. What could be fairer than that?

Almost all this money is trust fund money; it cannot be used for any other purpose.

The administration and the President did say that in this bill we will be spending more than we take in. That is just not true. There is \$9.7 billion today unused beyond what this bill would do; \$9.7 billion in the trust fund today.

At the end of this bill, 5 years down the road, there will be almost \$11 billion in that trust fund. So what we are doing—we are not spending more than what we take in; we are almost breaking our word with the American people in collecting the tax money and not spending it for these needed purposes.

Demonstration projects in this bill, the Members of Congress who vote for all the tax in this bill are dedicating and indicating 1.6 percent of it. That is all, 1.6; where the Secretary of Transportation, without it being public as our demonstration projects, without it being written down in the bill, without it being publicly voted on, she does not have 1.6 percent, she has 6 percent of the money in discretionary funds to be able to pass around throughout the country.

All the rest of the money goes to the State legislators.

□ 1430

And all the rest of the money goes to the State legislatures. Those State legislatures who do not raise the taxes or vote for the Federal money here will have the final say on all the other over 90 percent of the bill. So certainly the demonstration projects is a false issue.

One other issue, the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit. I do not know of anyone in either House of Congress who was more opposed to raising this speed limit up to the 65 or 75, as we know it will be in reality, should the States pass this.

Much as I oppose that increase, this total bill is much too important for the entire Nation to have us not pass this at this time. And the fact is for anyone who wishes to have the option of the States to go to 65, it can be done in only one way, and that is overriding this veto. If this veto is not overridden here and in the other body,

the 65 is gone, at least for the remainder of this Congress.

As you know, the 65 passed in the House by 11 votes. A six-vote turnaround would have been able to defeat it. Commitments were made by people from the East, mainly, who voted for the 65 for the West, if they want it. Over 12 Members have already signed papers saying that if the West, and if the West wants to defeat this bill, then 65 will come back and those 12 will then not vote for 65 as they did, but vote against it. That 12 votes is a 24-vote turnaround. So that will be dead.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit I want to agree with the chairman implicitly; it is either now or never.

Mr. HOWARD. As the author of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, I will have mixed emotions about what happens, but that is the fact.

The President said, pass another bill in 6 days, send it back and we will sign it into law.

We received the President's bill, maybe coincidentally, at 5 p.m. last Friday evening, 5 p.m.

Our staff worked, looking it over, Saturday, Sunday and yesterday. Unfortunately, there was no member of the administration available during all of that time to discuss the administration's bill. We have it here. It is a huge, large bill; not the four small items that the President talked about. There are over 30 major policy changes in this bill.

Should our committee do nothing else under our jurisdiction, whether it be water issues, aviation or anything else, it would take us at least until the early summer to be able to bring a bill here to the floor of the House.

The Senate would do the same. It would be early fall before we could possibly get a conference report on a measure this large back to the House of Representatives, and these 800,000 jobs will be lost and will be lost for the entire good. We cannot get this year's construction season back again.

So I urge the Members to please sustain the Congress. Four hundred and seven of you voted for this bill when we brought it before the House as a conference report, 407.

This bill is just as good now as it was a couple of weeks ago. So if we want to progress in the construction, in the building and rebuilding of this Nation, then we should certainly vote for this override.

I thank the members of my committee, the staff, and the Members of the House for attention on this vital matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 350, nays 73, not voting 10, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 39]

#### YEAS—350

Ackerman	Dicks	Hughes
Akaka	Dingell	Hutto
Alexander	DioGuardi	Jacobs
Anderson	Dixon	Johnson (CT)
Andrews	Donnelly	Johnson (SD)
Anthony	Dorgan (ND)	Jones (NC)
Applegate	Dowdy	Jones (TN)
Aspin	Downey	Jontz
Atkins	Duncan	Kanjorski
AuCoin	Durbin	Kaptur
Barnard	Dwyer	Kastenmeier
Bateman	Dymally	Kennedy
Bates	Dyson	Kennelly
Bellenson	Early	Kildee
Bennett	Eckart	Klecza
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	Kolter
Bereuter	Emerson	Konnyu
Berman	English	Kostmayer
Bevill	Erdreich	LaFalce
Biaggi	Espy	Lancaster
Bilbray	Evans	Lantos
Bilirakis	Fascell	Leach (IA)
Boehrlert	Fazio	Leath (TX)
Boggs	Fields	Lehman (CA)
Boland	Fish	Lehman (FL)
Boner (TN)	Flake	Leland
Bonior (MI)	Flippo	Lent
Bonker	Florio	Levin (MI)
Borski	Foglietta	Levine (CA)
Bosco	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Lewis (FL)
Boxer	Ford (TN)	Lewis (GA)
Brennan	Frank	Lightfoot
Brooks	Frenzel	Lipinski
Brown (CA)	Frost	Livingston
Bruce	Gallo	Lloyd
Bryant	Garcia	Lott
Bunning	Gaydos	Lowery (CA)
Bustamante	Gejdenson	Lowry (WA)
Byron	Gibbons	Lukens, Thomas
Callahan	Gilman	MacKay
Campbell	Glickman	Madigan
Cardin	Gonzalez	Manton
Carper	Goodling	Markey
Carr	Gordon	Marlenee
Chandler	Grandy	Martin (IL)
Chapman	Grant	Martin (NY)
Chappell	Gray (IL)	Martinez
Cheney	Gray (PA)	Matsui
Clarke	Green	Mavroules
Clay	Guarini	Mazzoli
Clinger	Hall (OH)	McCandless
Coelho	Hall (TX)	McCloskey
Coleman (MO)	Hamilton	McCurdy
Coleman (TX)	Hammerschmidt	McDade
Collins	Harris	McEwen
Combest	Hastert	McGrath
Conte	Hatcher	McHugh
Conyers	Hawkins	McKinney
Cooper	Hayes (IL)	McMillen (MD)
Courter	Hayes (LA)	Meyers
Coyne	Hefner	Mfume
Craig	Hertel	Mica
Crockett	Hiler	Michel
Darden	Hochbrueckner	Miller (CA)
Daub	Holloway	Miller (WA)
Davis (IL)	Hopkins	Mineta
Davis (MI)	Horton	Moakley
de la Garza	Houghton	Mollohan
DeFazio	Howard	Montgomery
Dellums	Hoyer	Moody
Derrick	Hubbard	Morella
Dickinson	Huckaby	Morrison (WA)

Mrazek	Roemer	Stokes
Murphy	Rogers	Stratton
Murtha	Rose	Studds
Myers	Roukema	Sundquist
Nagle	Rowland (CT)	Swift
Natcher	Rowland (GA)	Swindall
Neal	Roybal	Synar
Nelson	Russo	Tallon
Nichols	Sabo	Tauke
Nielson	Saiki	Tauzin
Nowak	Savage	Taylor
Oakar	Sawyer	Thomas (CA)
Oberstar	Saxton	Thomas (GA)
Obey	Schaefer	Torres
Olin	Scheuer	Torricelli
Ortiz	Schroeder	Towns
Owens (NY)	Schuetz	Trafiacant
Owens (UT)	Schulze	Traxler
Packard	Schumer	Udall
Panetta	Sharp	Upton
Parris	Shaw	Valentine
Pashayan	Shuster	Vander Jagt
Patterson	Sikorski	Vento
Pease	Skaggs	Visclosky
Penny	Skeen	Volkmere
Pepper	Skelton	Vucanovich
Perkins	Slattery	Walgren
Petri	Slaughter (NY)	Watkins
Pickett	Smith (FL)	Waxman
Pickle	Smith (IA)	Weber
Price (IL)	Smith (NE)	Weiss
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Weldon
Quillen	Smith, Robert	Wheat
Rahall	(OR)	Whittaker
Rangel	Snowe	Whitten
Ravenel	Solarz	Williams
Ray	Spence	Wilson
Regula	Spratt	Wise
Richardson	St Germain	Wolpe
Rinaldo	Staggers	Wortley
Ritter	Stallings	Wyden
Robinson	Stangeland	Yates
Rodino	Stark	Yatron
Roe	Stenholm	Young (AK)

#### NAYS—73

Archer	Gradison	Molinari
Armey	Gregg	Moorhead
Badham	Gunderson	Oxley
Baker	Hansen	Porter
Ballenger	Hefley	Pursell
Bartlett	Henry	Rhodes
Barton	Herger	Roberts
Billiey	Hunter	Roth
Boulter	Hyde	Schneider
Broomfield	Inhofe	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CO)	Ireland	Shumway
Buechner	Jeffords	Sisisky
Burton	Kasich	Slaughter (VA)
Coats	Kemp	Smith (TX)
Coble	Kolbe	Smith, Denny
Coughlin	Kyl	(OR)
Crane	Lagomarsino	Smith, Robert
DeLay	Latta	(NH)
DeWine	Lujan	Solomon
Dornan (CA)	Lukens, Donald	Stump
Dreier	Lungren	Sweeney
Fawell	Mack	Walker
Galgley	McCollum	Wolf
Gekas	McMillan (NC)	Wyllie
Gingrich	Miller (OH)	Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—10

Annunzio	Feighan	Ridge
Daniel	Gephardt	Rostenkowski
Dannemeyer	Jenkins	
Edwards (OK)	Morrison (CT)	

□ 1450

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Gephardt and Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma against.

Mr. GUNDERSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.



The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

#### CONCERNING VIOLATIONS BY THE SOVIET UNION OF ITS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) concerning the continued violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligations, especially its violations of the right to emigrate.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas the Soviet Union is obligated, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the internationally recognized right to emigrate;

Whereas, despite its international obligations, the Soviet Union continues to deny to many of its citizens their basic human rights and to incarcerate individuals, known as "Prisoners of Conscience", for attempting to exercise these rights;

Whereas, the Soviet authorities have been waging a concerted campaign against teachers of Hebrew and other Jewish activists, including imprisoning Soviet Jews for their efforts to emigrate or exercise their cultural and religious rights;

Whereas the Soviet Union recently adopted emigration regulations which do not guarantee the internationally recognized right to emigrate and, in fact, deny the right to emigrate for any but narrowly defined "personal reasons", which codify the previous pretexts for denying emigration even in cases involving the reunification of immediate families, and which substantially reduce the number of individuals eligible to apply to emigrate; and

Whereas 400,000 Soviet Jews have indicated, at considerable personal risk, their desire to leave the Soviet Union, but during 1986 less than 1,000 were allowed to emigrate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) strongly protests the continued violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligations, especially its is-

suance of restrictive new emigration regulations;

(2) declares that continued human rights abuses by the Soviet Union, especially its refusal to permit all those who wish to emigrate to do so, seriously affect the atmosphere for productive negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on other aspects of our bilateral relations and make it more difficult for the United States to reach viable agreements with the Soviet Union;

(3) calls upon the Soviet authorities immediately to release all "Prisoners of Conscience" and immediately to permit all "refuseniks", divided spouses, and others who wish to emigrate to do so; and

(4) dedicates itself to support, as a priority during the 100th Congress, the restoration of internationally recognized human rights to all Soviet citizens, especially restoration of the right to emigrate to those Soviet Jews and others who have requested exit visas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to this rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

□ 1500

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 34, legislation concerning continued violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligation, especially its violations of the right to emigrate.

Virulent anti-Semitism continues to be a hallmark of Soviet policy, as the Government attempts to destroy every vestige of Jewish culture and identity. Mr. Gorbachev's new policy of democratization is promising, but is it substantive. We have not yet seen a significant change in Soviet human rights policy. The harassment of Jewish activists has not decreased, anti-Semitism pervades the government-sponsored media, and Jewish homes are still not safe from illegal search and seizures.

Mr. Speaker, hearing the latest reports about the political prisoners who have either been released or are to be released in the near future, as well as the scheduled increase in the number of emigres permitted to leave the Soviet Union is encouraging. But it is just a beginning. This Congress must keep the issue of Soviet Jewry on the international agenda. As long as even one Jew remains in the Soviet Union against his or her will, our battle must continue. The Soviet Union is sensitive to external criticism of its domestic practices. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to make sure that our Government puts human rights on the same level with arms control.

I would like to commend the distinguished gentlemen from Florida and

Michigan, Chairman FASCELL and Mr. BROOMFIELD, for their excellent leadership on this vital issue, as well as other major issues which come before this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention, and to the attention of my fellow colleagues, a recent article from the March 25 edition of the New York Times on the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. I also want to mention the plight of a particular Jewish family from the Soviet Union who is trying desperately to come to the West.

#### SOVIET EMIGRATION OF JEWS IS HIGHEST IN LAST 5 YEARS

(By Philip Taubman)

Moscow, March 24.—More than 400 Soviet Jews have so far received permission to emigrate in March, the highest monthly figure since the end of 1981, Western diplomats and Soviet officials said today.

While still far below the rate of the peak year of 1979, when more than 4,000 Jews left each month, the March figure—expected to go as high as 500—represents a sharp rise over the monthly rate in the last five years and a fourfold rise over January.

If the increase continues, it could ease one of the major problems in Soviet-American relations. The Reagan Administration has stressed that improvement in ties could not occur without liberalized Soviet emigration.

[Jerry Goodman, executive director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, said that if the figure of 500 was reached this month, it would be "the first significant step in unfreezing the backlog" of Jews seeking to leave.]

#### MINORITIES GET PREFERENCE

Emigration from the Soviet Union is generally restricted for all citizens, but Jews and some other minorities, notably ethnic Germans and Armenians, have been getting preferential treatment by being permitted to leave in substantial numbers over the years on grounds of family reunification. The Jewish exodus reached a peak of more than 51,000 in 1979 before dropping off. Last year 914 Jews left.

The increase in emigration this year follows the release of close to 100 dissidents imprisoned or sent into exile for criticizing Government policies.

Under Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the authorities have moved in several areas to open up Soviet society, both to energize the nation and to reduce outside criticism.

#### NO BASIC CHANGE EXPECTED

Some Western diplomats said the steps in Jewish emigration seemed intended mainly for foreign consumption and were motivated less by a change in attitude about emigration in general than a desire to lessen friction with the West by allowing Jews to leave.

President Reagan and other Western leaders have tied progress on human rights issues, including the easing of restrictions of emigration, to advances on other issues, including arms control and trade.

The Moscow diplomats said that Mr. Gorbachev might also hope to limit the possibility of anti-Soviet demonstrations if he visits Washington later this year. American Jewish groups have threatened protests.

The diplomats said the Jewish emigration rate started to increase in February, reach-

ing a level of about 250 who had received visas.

"These are people who have either left or are about to go," one diplomat said.

In New York, the National Conference said the number who actually left were 98 in January, 146 in February, and 370 through March 21. But diplomats said the number of those who had received permission so far this month to leave was already more than 400.

The Moscow diplomats said the rise in Jewish emigration suggested that the authorities were following through on promises to review the backlog of applications, estimated at more than 10,000. So far this month more than 400 Jews have received visas, and about a hundred others are expected to get them by April 1. An exact count is unavailable.

Last week a Soviet official said in Washington that 10,000 to 12,000 Jews were likely to get exit visas this year.

#### MOST DO NOT GO TO ISRAEL

Under current procedures, most Jews emigrating from the Soviet Union leave on the basis of visas listing Israel as the country of destination.

The Soviet Union severed diplomatic relations with Israel during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. The Dutch Embassy represents Israeli interests here and issues Israeli visas to Jews who receive Soviet exit permits.

In recent years, however, an increasing number of Soviet Jews have chosen instead to go to the United States once they arrive in Vienna, usually the first stop for emigrants.

The Israeli Government has been pressing the United States not to admit Jews directly from the Soviet Union and to have them proceed first to Israel on the basis of their Israeli visas. But the United States has insisted that the country of destination for Soviet Jewish emigrants be a matter of free choice.

Soviet officials have cautioned that a return to the large-scale emigration of the 1970's was unlikely. A total of more than 260,000 Jews have been allowed to emigrate since the exodus began in the late 1960's.

There are now about 1.7 million Jews in the Soviet Union, out of a population of 280 million, and the Israeli authorities and some Jewish groups abroad contend that as many as 400,000 still want to leave. Soviet officials say the number of would-be Jewish emigrants is far smaller.

There is no estimate of the number of other Soviet citizens who would want to emigrate if the barriers ever were lowered.

A new emigration law that took effect Jan. 1 allows emigration mainly on grounds of family reunification and was presented by Soviet officials as a codification of existing rules.

American officials and a number of Soviet émigrés contended that the new law was more restrictive than previous practice because it justified emigration only on the ground of reunification with close family members, excluding more distant relatives such as grandparents, cousins, uncles, and aunts.

Richard Schifter, an Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, said in January that 30,000 to 40,000 people would be eligible to leave under the new law.

Today, Western diplomats said that Soviet officials appeared to be interpreting the law more broadly than expected, allowing Jews with distant relatives in the West to leave.

"What we may be seeing is a housecleaning of those who have been waiting for years to go, but once that group has been thinned out, the rate will tighten up again," a diplomat said.

Word of the increase has started to spread among Moscow Jews who have had emigration applications pending for years. Many have been asked by the authorities to reapply.

Almost all those who have applied have lost their jobs. Emigration is considered virtual treason in the Soviet Union, and would-be emigrants are generally ostracized by Soviet society.

#### INCREASE CALLED SIGNIFICANT

Jerry Goodman, executive director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, said yesterday in an interview from Jerusalem:

"Certainly, if this number reaches the anticipated 450 to 500 this month, it would represent the first significant step in unfreezing the backlog.

"It is not yet a solution to the overriding problem of hundreds of thousands we are confident wish to leave. But it is nevertheless a move in that direction which bears promise for the future and it is something we will watch with eagerness."

The National Conference is an umbrella group of nearly 50 American organizations.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I am heartened by this report on Soviet emigration of Jews. But the Soviet Union has a long way to go. Although we have been led to believe that those Jews in the Soviet Union who wanted to emigrate have left, we cannot be deceived. We know about the separated families, the imprisoned activists, and the oppressed Jewish community. In my district, Larry and Linda Goldberg learned firsthand about this repression when their son Jason was to be in a twinning program for his bar-mitzvah with Vitaley Levitsky from the Soviet Union. Well, Jason never did see Vitaley. He and his mother and father were denied, and continue to be denied, exit visas from the Soviet Union. There are hundreds of cases such as the Levitsky's. All of us have an obligation to help these people, to make sure that the truth is not distorted so that they may someday be free.

I would like to commend organizations such as the National Conference of Soviet Jewry for the excellent work they do, not only on Jewish emigration, but on all aspects of human rights for the Jewish community. In particular, I would note the efforts of Mr. Mark Levin who keeps Members of Congress well-informed on these important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Pennsylva-

nia [Mr. YATRON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the leadership and many others in the House in strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 34, to protest the Soviet Union's continued violations of its human rights obligations.

The current leadership in the Soviet Union has made much of its so-called policy of glasnost or openness in recent propaganda pronouncements. The changes accompanying the new Soviet propaganda initiative do not reflect any Soviet shift toward democracy and human rights. Americans should not be misled into thinking that the Soviets are moving away from a centralized state run by a single Communist party which controls all aspects of political, economic, and social life.

Americans must understand that, when Gorbachev speaks of democratization, he means that power over some matters—primarily minor economic matters—may shift from one set of Communist Party bureaucrats to another set of Communist Party bureaucrats. He does not mean that the Communist Party will yield any measure of freedom to citizens of the Soviet Union.

Much has been made in recent weeks of the release from the gulag of a small number of Soviet dissidents. We should hardly view as some great liberalization the Soviet decision to shift in a handful of cases from outrageous and intolerable abuse of Soviet citizens, to merely disgusting abuse of them.

In spite of claims about new emigration regulations, only 914 Jews left the Soviet Union in 1986. Although this year's emigration statistics are encouraging, this is a slow beginning. Let us not forget that over 50,000 Jews left that country in 1969. It is regrettable that the much publicized new emigration regulation denies the right to emigrate to all but those having "personal reasons." 400,000 Jewish men, women, and children still want to leave that country.

Antisemitism continues to be a part of Soviet policy and Jewish activists are still harassed. There are still many separated families as well as refuseniks who are denied the right to leave the U.S.S.R.

If the Soviet leaders want better relationships with the West on such matters as trade and arms control, they should observe the internationally recognized human rights of all Soviet citizens, and especially of Soviet Jews, whose emigration the Soviets have consistently blocked.

I urge my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and pass the resolution to sent the Soviets a clear message on human rights.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the



chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, which I introduced along with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. BROOMFIELD, on behalf of the entire bipartisan leadership of the House. This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress regarding continuing violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights commitments, especially the right to emigrate.

This resolution is, in part, a response to emigration regulations promulgated in the Soviet Union late last year which became effective on January 1, of this year. These regulations actually limit the number of people eligible for emigration by codifying the restrictive Soviet practices which have been in effect since 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution highlights the plight of Soviet Jews and others whose basic human rights have been denied. It calls upon the Soviet Union to release all prisoners of conscience and permit all refuseniks, divided spouses, and others who wish to emigrate to do so. The resolution has nearly 200 cosponsors and is similar to one passed by the Senate earlier this session.

Emigration of Soviet Jews, on which this resolution focuses was, in 1986, at its lowest in 15 years. While approximately 400,000 Soviet Jews have indicated a desire to emigrate, only 914 Jews were permitted to leave last year. Despite expectations of a significant change in Soviet human rights policy and increased emigration, this dismal trend of low emigration rates continued in the first 2 months of 1987.

I am pleased to note, however, that the emigration figures for March will reflect a significant increase in the rate of Soviet Jewish emigration, up to somewhere between 400 and 500. We are very hopeful that this increased level represents the start of a trend. I understand that American Jewish leaders were in Moscow last week to discuss with Soviet authorities this issue and that those authorities have indicated a readiness to increase significantly the rate of Jewish emigration and to improve the situation for those Jews who remain in the U.S.S.R. I hope that Soviet actions in the coming months in the area of human rights, including the resolution of all refusenik cases, the release of all prisoners of conscience, and the reunification of all divided United States-Soviet spouses and families, will make future resolutions on this issue unnecessary. However, I believe that passage of House Concurrent Resolution 34 at this time will demonstrate to the Soviet Union the concern that we in the Congress share with the American Jewish community and others over this issue.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs considered the measure last week and ordered it reported favorably. We are bringing it to the floor now, Mr. Speaker, in order to allow Members an opportunity to express their concern and the House to act on this important issue before the Easter recess. As you know, our distinguished Speaker, Mr. WRIGHT, is leading

a delegation of members to the Soviet Union during the recess. An expression of overwhelming congressional concern on the issue at this time would bolster the delegation's efforts to convince their Soviet hosts of the need for significant human rights progress as an essential component of improved bilateral relations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, who has been a leader in human rights.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, and would like to commend the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, DANTE FASCELL, for bringing this measure to the floor.

This resolution is about human lives and human freedoms. It strongly protests continued human rights repression in the Soviet Union—and especially the new emigration regulations that ultimately may restrict the basic human right to choose one's place to live.

Many may question why such a resolution is so important—and necessary—today. After all, we are told, this is the age of Glasnost—or breathtaking change, liberalization, and openness, of an apparent thaw in the long Siberian winter of Stalinism. Dissidents have been released, censorship has been lifted a bit, and there's talk of secret ballot elections.

And just recently, American Jewish leaders who have returned from the Soviet Union say they are encouraged by signs that emigration will increase this year and that restrictions on Jewish life will be loosened.

So why a resolution condemning Soviet human rights and emigration practices? Because for years we have been hearing Soviet Human rights promises without seeing any real human rights results.

Earlier this morning the Helsinki Commission heard testimony from Irina Ratushinskaya, the dissident Soviet poet who served time in prison simply for expressing her thoughts in poetry. And she warned us not to get carried away by Glasnost, not to erase the boundary between Soviet promises and Soviet realities.

Mr. Speaker, Soviet history teaches us that enticing moments of reform are often followed by long, gray years of repression. Today, even with Glasnost, there's still the Soviet reality of forced labor, psychiatric abuse, 400,000 refuseniks, and rigid bureaucratic controls.

In 1975 the Soviet Union joined 34 other nations in signing the Helsinki Final Act. This is a solemn document, because it commits signatory states to

basic human rights—to freedom of speech, religion, and movement, to family reunifications, to the free flow of ideas. The Soviet Union is far from living up to these commitments.

And so today, as we hear new Soviet promises, we remain wary. We welcome the gestures of Glasnost but look for certainties that basic human rights and freedoms will not be violated again.

With this resolution, we are saying to the Soviets that progress will not be measured by the number of dissidents released, but by the elimination of arbitrary arrest and confinement altogether.

With this resolution, we judge Soviet human rights practices not by the monthly figures of freed refuseniks, but by the end to all restrictions on emigration—and the guarantee that the new emigration law, with its narrow emigration requirements, will not restrict emigration after an initial round of releases.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we will view the Soviet Union and its human rights practices by the way that country lives up to its commitments under the Helsinki accords. That, really, is what this resolution is all about. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution—and remind the Soviets that we are watching.

Mr. Speaker, I would again like to congratulate the sponsors of this legislation and the committee on bringing this resolution to the floor in such a timely fashion.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. I wish to commend both Chairman FASCELL of the committee and, of course, BILL BROOMFIELD, the senior ranking Republican member for introducing it and expediting its passage to the floor, as well as my good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, GUS YATRON.

Mr. Speaker, in these recent months, we have all heard a lot of discussion about glasnost, what the Soviets call openness. And with all of the blandishments of a professional con man, Mr. Gorbachev has orchestrated a sophisticated window-dressing campaign that is aimed at masking the damaging realities of life in the Soviet Union today. But all of Gorbachev's smiles and expressions of good will cannot erase the truth. Make no mistake: The Soviet leadership remains committed to the perpetuation of a dogma that substitutes the worship of God with the worship of man—the idolatry of the Soviet state.

The truth behind glasnost is revealed by the fact that in 1986, the year when so-called openness was introduced in the Soviet Union, only 914 Jewish people were allowed to emi-

grate from Gorbachev's workers paradise. That is the second smallest 1-year total since 1968. Moreover, the State-sponsored anti-Semitism that has been accelerating since the waning years of the Brezhnev regime shows no signs of abating. And by passing this resolution today we are declaring our solidarity with those brave people in the Soviet Union whose faith and courage have brought them into conflict with the Godless ideology that has sponsored the greatest assault on the human spirit that the world has ever witnessed.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this morning's newspapers are carrying stories that the Soviets may allow as many as 11,000 Jewish people to emigrate this year. We all hope that this may be true. But let us remember President Kennedy's warning that "civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof." I am particularly glad that this resolution makes reference to the fact "continued human rights abuses by the Soviet Union, especially its refusal to permit all those who wish to emigrate to do so, seriously affect the atmosphere for productive negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union \* \* \*" may we never lose sight of this linkage. And I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

□ 1510

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Human Rights Caucus, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for the outstanding job they have done in bringing this resolution before us.

I think at a time when the whole western world is wondering whether Mr. Gorbachev really means it when he talks about opening up, it is important for us to send a message to him, and the message could not be more timely than it is today, the day when the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mrs. Thatcher, is in Moscow and just a few days before our own Speaker, as well as our own Secretary of State, will be in Moscow dealing with Mr. Gorbachev.

It has been my impression that the Soviets have acquiesced in treating human rights as sort of an obligatory side issued that the American people and the American Congress and the American administration are interested in.

As long as that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we will not be talking on the same wave length, because human rights is central to the concerns of the

American people and the American Congress.

I applaud Mrs. Thatcher, who made it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that it is unrealistic to expect progress in the field of arms control and arms reduction unless arms control and arms reduction is inextricably intertwined with the issue of human rights. If the Soviet Union violates its commitments on human rights, we have every reason to suspect that they will violate their commitments in the fields of arms control and arms reduction.

We are, therefore, unanimous, Republicans, and Democrats in this body and across the land in telling the Soviet Union and its new leadership that human rights must be addressed by them as a central issue between the United States and the Soviet Union and once that is done, once their people are given elementary freedoms, freedoms that we take so much for granted, then the atmosphere will be present hopefully for progress on other issues.

Human rights are indivisible. Christians and Jews and Moslems throughout the Soviet Union have a wide range of human rights complaints. They must all be addressed.

It is high time this powerful industrial society recognizes that it has grown up, that it can no longer trample upon the elemental rights of the people who live within its borders.

The Congress will not go away on this issue, Mr. Speaker. We will insist every day and every year that the Soviet Union live up to its international obligations under the Helsinki accords and other agreements, and once it does, the climate of this tiny globe will improve for the better.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who is the cochairman of the Human Rights Subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for their leadership on this issue and for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are good signs. Let us be honest. The numbers were up last month. These are the overall numbers, not just the refusenik celebrities and prisoners of conscience, but people. That is a good sign.

Recently I went to the Soviet Embassy. I had been there before. I went there to attempt to obtain a Propiska, or an internal passport, for a man who had just been let out of the Soviet prison and could not get a job or a place to live in his hometown of Leningrad without that Propiska.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was received courteously. I was listened to respectfully. The discussion was for the first

time in my memory relevant to the subject I was bringing before the people of the Embassy and the Propiska has been issued.

Perhaps there has been a change of heart, but frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have to remain skeptical. Even yesterday as Prime Minister Thatcher was urging upon the Soviets a question of human freedom and rights under law, Mikhail Gorbachev replied with the usual Soviet hard line about unemployment in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today I am wearing a green ribbon to bring to the attention of the Members and the American people the case of Dr. Benjamin Charney, a Moscow refusenik suffering from the deadliest type of skin cancer, malignant melanoma.

Dr. Charney is the last of five cancer patients who applied together last year still in the Soviet Union. Two of these individuals were saved, but because of delays in permission to emigrate, two others have died. Dr. Charney remains.

Dr. Charney has been waiting since 1979 to join his brother in the United States and receive the medical care he so desperately needs. He has repeatedly been refused permission to emigrate on the grounds of a security clearance.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charney left a job that had nothing to do with security more than 15 years ago.

This is a matter of life and death. I invite my colleagues to join and show their concern over Dr. Charney's plight by wearing a green ribbon, a symbol of the life now endangered by malignant melanoma and the Soviet bureaucracy, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution urging, yet again upon the Soviet Union, adherence to standards of basic human rights and human conduct that all civilized nations observe.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], an outstanding member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the measure now before us, House Concurrent Resolution 34, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], along with the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for bringing this measure to the floor today for full House consideration; and I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the



gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for their supporting remarks.

House Concurrent Resolution 34 expresses the sense of Congress regarding the recently implemented restrictive Soviet emigration regulations, which severely limit those individuals who will be allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union for family reunification purposes.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary defines a family as "a group of persons of common ancestry." Yet the Soviet Union, through its implementation of these restrictive regulations, has defined a family as consisting only of first degree relatives, that is, parents and children, brothers, sisters, and spouses. Grandparents are not included, nor are first cousins, aunts, uncles, or other relations. Such a narrow definition distorts what we know to be reality. Whether one is a Soviet or an American, British, or Italian, families usually involve a larger number of people than the nuclear group. By all definitions, whether anthropological, sociological, or literal, any family is the sum of its many parts. By adopting these new regulations, Soviet officials seek to create an imbalance of the natural norm. And it is to this cruelty, aimed primarily at Soviet Jews, that House Concurrent Resolution 34 addresses itself.

In the last few months the world has witnessed some changes in the Soviet Union and the leadership's attitude toward its people and their lives.

Some human rights activists, among them Soviet Jews, have been released from labor camps and prisons, although many more still remain unjustly incarcerated. Yet of those Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience who have been released, only Zachar Zunshine has been allowed to emigrate. Long-term refuseniks such as Ida Nudel and the Slepaks continue to languish even though under the new regulations, they clearly qualify for family reunification and hundreds of thousands more are awaiting the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

A number of interviews with Soviet officials in the Western media have yielded responses like "if people aren't happy here in the Soviet Union, they should be able to leave." Of course, we know that isn't possible. Theory and practice in the Soviet Union are often mutually exclusive. Our support for the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and the International Declaration on Human Rights have not diminished in the least; on the contrary, our commitment to human rights for Soviet Jews and others is greater than ever.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 34 is the result of Natan Shcharansky's personal visit to numerous Members of Congress and the leadership of both parties. It is a measure that requests compliance with one of the most basic of human

rights, the right to be with one's family. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure overwhelmingly, and in so doing, to send a clear signal to the Soviet Government that the new restrictive emigration regulations impinge upon human rights.

□ 1520

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a new Member of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 34.

I think it is important that this measure comes before us today, so soon after it has been announced that more than 400 Soviet Jews were given visas to emigrate in March. We must not allow ourselves to think that the granting of emigration visas to 400 Soviet Jews in 1 month even begins to address the restoration of this internationally recognized right. Remember, in 1979, when Jewish emigration was at its highest, more than 4,000 Jews left each month. Remember too, that there are 400,000 Soviet Jews who have indicated their desire to leave the Soviet Union but have not been allowed and are suffering because of this desire.

This resolution dedicates the 100th Congress to support, as a priority, restoration of emigration rights in the Soviet Union. I emphasize the word "restoration." On this issue, despite cosmetic actions orchestrated to match their glasnost rhetoric, the Soviets still violate their obligations under international agreements to respect basic human rights and freedoms, including the right to emigrate. This resolution is important because it sends the signal that we will not be fooled by empty actions and that the historic 100th Congress, in the historic 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution—the document that guarantees Americans the rights and freedoms that so many in the Soviet Union fight and suffer for—is dedicating itself to the restoration of emigration rights—and all human rights—in the Soviet Union.

I take this opportunity to invite my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and myself in two special orders following regular business today that will address the issue of Soviet emigration policy and, in general, how glasnost has impacted on the human rights struggle in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Human Rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which is before us today. As a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 34, I am encouraged that a resolution focusing on the internationally recognized right for all individuals to emigrate is being given consideration by the House so early in the 100th Congress. It is a clear indication of our priorities.

Much has been made of the new Soviet policy of glasnost or openness. While Mr. Gorbachev has been talking about a change in Soviet policy and attitudes, the West has not witnessed much of a substantive difference in the emigration policy, especially for certain individuals and groups including Soviet Jews. Only time will reveal the sincerity and genuineness of this new campaign.

The right to emigrate from one's native country is fundamental and has been enshrined in international agreements such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act. Nonetheless, it was most disconcerting when on January 1 of this year, the Soviet Union issued new emigration regulations which severely restrict the right to emigrate, and even travel, to immediate relatives and family members. The number of individuals now eligible for visa applications has been drastically reduced due to these new restrictions.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Soviet officials may now deny travel visas without explanation. While these regulations merely codify ongoing Soviet policies, this blatant disregard for free movement is unacceptable. In addition, as noted in this resolution before us, these persistent and premeditated human rights abuses seriously affect the atmosphere needed for productive negotiations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Foremost on the agenda for emigration rights, are the cases of individuals seeking to be reunified with their families.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a constituent, Andrea Wine, who has been separated from her husband since their marriage on November 21, 1985. For 16 months, Ms. Wine has had to travel periodically to Moscow to be with her husband, Victor Faermark. Mr. Speaker, this is cruel. With a doctoral degree in chemistry, Mr. Faermark was working as a research scientist when he first applied to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. in 1971. Immediately he was fired from his job and later was denied the right to emigrate on the grounds of "possession of state secrets." Not since 1968 has Mr. Faermark worked with any project which could remotely be classified as secret. For the second time since their mar-

riage, Mr. Faermark's emigration application was denied on March 12.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Jews living in the Soviet Union who wish to reunite with their families and emigrate has been well-documented and publicized. Despite the fact that almost 400,000 Soviet Jews have indicated their desire to leave the Soviet Union, the numbers allowed to depart have been extremely low since 1981, the Soviet Union has forced the numbers allowed to emigrate to decline. In the last 15 years, the worst year for Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union was in 1984 with only 896 departures. Unfortunately, 1986 followed closely behind with only 914 cases resolved.

Not only have thousands been denied exit visas. Many Soviet Jews have been imprisoned because of their efforts to emigrate or exercise their cultural and religious rights. Of particular concern have been the imprisonment and persecution of Hebrew teachers and other Jewish activists. Mr. Speaker, in the 99th Congress I sponsored a resolution which called upon the U.S.S.R. to cease its concentrated and systematic persecution of Hebrew teachers and cultural activists. This resolution had broad, bipartisan support with 145 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, last month the Soviets made a disturbing announcement regarding the requests for emigration made by several refuseniks who have been applying for up to 17 years. In a publicly released statement, the Moscow visa office published the names of Soviet Jews who will never be allowed to leave the Soviet Union because, according to the Soviet Government, they were once employed in secret government projects. Certainly the work done by these individuals is now outdated or has become public knowledge throughout the world. Complete denial and the use of "never" flies in the face of the new glasnost policy.

In supporting the resolution which is before us, Congress will call upon the Soviet authorities to release immediately all "Prisoners of Conscience," and to grant the immediate approval of emigration applications of all refuseniks, divided spouses and any others who have requested exit visas. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 34, a resolution concerning violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligations, I rise in support of passage of this resolution. Although the Soviet Union is calling for a greater emphasis on human rights, it remains to be seen whether they are really serious. Of particular importance is the question of Soviet Jewish emigration. According to the Helsinki Act of 1975 and other similar agreements, the Soviet Union pledged to honor human rights, including the right to emigrate. Unfortunately,

Soviet Jews have been the victims of discrimination by the Communist Party, and at the same time they have not been free to leave the country.

Soviet Jews are generally denied access to the best schools, and therefore, are unable to enter into the best careers. Even those who have overcome the obstacles of discrimination, are unable to reach the peak of their profession. Not only are Jews almost entirely absent from the state and party apparatuses, but they are harassed by official Soviet anti-semitic propaganda. Jewish cultural and religious expression is also extremely limited and restricted. Hebrew and Yiddish schools are completely nonexistent and there are fewer than 60 synagogues left in the Soviet Union.

In addition to being subjected to discrimination, there has also been a crackdown on Jewish emigration and activism within the Soviet Union. Jewish emigration steadily rose throughout the 1970's, reaching a peak in 1979 of 51,333. Since then, however, the numbers have decreased dramatically. In 1985, only 1,140 Jews were allowed to emigrate, and for 1986 the number was again slightly over 1,000. On January 3 of this year, Leningrad Soviet Jewish activist Vladimir Liftshits was arrested and sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp on charges of anti-Soviet slander. Other Jewish activists remain in labor camps after years of imprisonment and after suffering severe health problems.

In conclusion, I urge you to support House Concurrent Resolution 34 and officially condemn the terrible treatment of the Jewish people by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been allowed to ignore their human rights obligations for too long, and a better recognition of basic freedoms is needed. Until the Soviet Union changes its rhetoric and finally grants the Jewish people their freedom, better relations with the Soviets cannot be expected.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for over 2 million Jews in the Soviet Union, 1986 was a year of dramatic, but largely disappointing developments.

While a policy of glasnost [openness] dominated the Western perception of the Soviet Union, the character and direction of Mikhail Gorbachev's Jewish policy belie this perception. As a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 34, I strongly support its condemnation of the continued violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligations, especially its violations of the right to emigrate.

Although Gorbachev has promoted certain important reforms of the Soviet system, the Jews in the Soviet Union continue to suffer. The new emigration decree amounted to little more than rhetoric. In fact, there is a continuing shutdown of Jewish emigration, as well as persistent harassment and intimidation of Jewish self-study efforts to sustain culture and religion.

The facts are that only 914 Jews were permitted to leave the Soviet Union in 1986, compared with 1,140 in 1985, down from 896 the previous year, and 51,000 in 1979. If the Soviet Union is truly serious about human rights, it need only free the prisoners of conscience, including those whom it has incarcerated for teaching Hebrew and insisting on the right to be repatriated to Israel; grant visas to

the thousands of refuseniks; and start issuing visas to the 400,000 Soviet Jews who have initiated the emigration procedure.

I will be visiting the Soviet Union later this month with some of my colleagues, and human rights remains my major concern. The timing of our visit could not be better. As the Soviet Union seeks greater détente and normalization of relations with the United States, we will have a unique opportunity to express our profound concern for those Soviet citizens who are still denied fundamental human rights.

Passage of this legislation will be a tremendous assist in our effort to impress upon the Soviets the importance we attach to concrete improvements in their observation of human rights. I urge passage of this important and timely legislation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman, DANTE FASCELL for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 34—protesting human rights abuses occurring in the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that something new and important is taking place in the Soviet Union under Secretary-General Mikhail Gorbachev. Gorbachev's new domestic program of openness, known as glasnost, has already improved human rights in the Soviet Union. Last month, the Soviets announced the release of 140 political prisoners and promised to examine the cases of an additional 140. To date the State Department has documented the release of 90 of these prisoners. By the end of March, over 700 Soviet Jews will have been allowed to leave the Soviet Union in 1987. Some hope that as many as 10,000 Soviet Jews will leave by the year's end—as compared with 914 last year and 1,140 the year before.

But in many ways, glasnost has just been a public relations device—to make a good impression on intellectuals living in the Soviet Union and to make a good impression abroad. In actual fact, the Soviet Union continues to violate the human rights of its people. Religious arrests continue at a high level. Prison conditions remain extremely bad. With the exception of one BBC station, the jamming of foreign radio broadcasts continues. The new laws on emigration are now tighter than ever. In the past weeks, many emigration cases have been denied—without explanation. Soviet officials have named eight refuseniks in particular who will never get out of the Soviet Union. There are cancer patients in the Soviet Union, waiting to leave for medical treatment. Last week, Leon Charny began a hunger strike for his brother Benjamin, who is dying from cancer and yet has been denied the right to seek treatment outside of the Soviet Union.

To date, glasnost has offered hope, but little more than hope. House Concurrent Resolution 34 calls upon the Soviet leadership to go beyond mere gestures. It calls upon the Soviet leadership to honor its obligations—under the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe—to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. I urge my colleagues in the House to show a clear sign of our commitment to human rights in the Soviet Union by lending their full support to this important piece of legislation.



Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the human rights situation in the Soviet Union is in a continuing state of peril. We must not be fooled by Secretary Gorbachev's implementation of a new open glasnost policy intended to heighten the Soviet administration's tolerance of religious, political, and educational practices. Instead, we must see that despite the attention afforded the few released refuseniks and prisoners of conscience, nearly 400,000 additional Soviet Jews await the chance to enjoy a life free of oppression.

Soviet promises are clearly not being fulfilled. Upon adjournment of both the October 1986 Reykjavik and November 1986 Geneva summit meetings, Soviet intentions of stricter adherence to the humanitarian language of the Helsinki accords were announced. Such adherence to the accords would include increased permission of emigration applicants. However, figures show that 20 percent fewer applicants were permitted to leave the country in 1986 as compared to 1985.

Clearly the situation at present represents merely an attempt to establish a facade of Western humanitarian policy. The new codification of emigration decree issued in November 1986, while seemingly liberal, in actuality provides for emigration permission in only specialized and restricted situations. A careful reading of the decree shows that the chances of emigration are hardly more propitious than in earlier cases. Under the new decree, emigration is permitted only on the basis of family reunification with family including only parents, children, and siblings. Others not meeting these reunification standards are denied the basic right to emigrate, despite the implementation of the progressive decree.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we take a firm stand on this issue and collectively denounce Soviet treatment of fundamental rights.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, which expresses concern for the plight of Soviet Jews. I believe this resolution is appropriate because each of us knows several cases where Soviet authorities have denied internationally recognized human rights to people whose only crimes are to want to learn their own language and culture, to teach their religion, and to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union's human rights record continues to be dismal despite Mr. Gorbachev's openness policy, which I gather is supposed to make the Soviet Union a more livable place. But there are over 400,000 Soviet Jews who no longer want to live in the U.S.S.R. and who want to emigrate. Most of those who apply for exit visas will be arrested, charged with having committed a "crime against the state," put in prison for "leading a parasitic way of life," and generally harassed and mistreated.

The new emigration law, moreover, requires these people to produce an invitation from an immediate relative, such as a parent or a spouse, in order to be considered for an exit visa. Under the old law, an invitation from any relative, including distant relatives, sufficed. What this means is that Mr. Gorbachev's rhetoric remains just that. So much for openness, Mr. Speaker.

I believe we in Congress can do much to help Soviet Jews. Supporting the resolution

now under consideration is one way. I urge all my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 34 and thereby send a strong message to Moscow that the American people, through their representatives, will not tolerate the oppression of Soviet Jews.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, which was introduced by my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL and Mr. BROOMFIELD. As former chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and current chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, I am particularly interested in the link between improved respect for human rights by the Soviet Union and increased commercial ties between our two nations. It is a well-known fact that the Soviets want greater access to both the United States markets and United States goods. Also highly publicized is Gorbachev's Glasnost, or openness policy, driven by a desire for improved international opinion on the subject of Soviet violations of human rights, particularly of Jewish emigration.

I believe that passage of House Concurrent Resolution 34 at this time would achieve two goals. First, a strong expression of congressional concern prior to an official delegation visit to the Soviet Union during Easter recess would bolster the delegation's efforts to relate the need for significant human rights progress to improved bilateral relations.

The great hardships suffered by Soviet Jews is well-known and has been a major irritant to United States-Soviet relations over the years. A significant easing of the problem would go far toward improving the dialog between Moscow and Washington.

Second, passage of this resolution would send an important signal of support to American Jewish leaders currently in Moscow to discuss the issue of Jewish emigration with Soviet authorities. Morris J. Abrams, president of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, who is presently involved in the discussions, was quoted today in the Washington Post as saying that American Jews are prepared to help the Soviets improve their relations with Washington.

Mr. Abrams told Soviet officials that if emigration rates grew sufficiently, he and his colleagues would recommend suspension of the Jackson-Vannick trade restriction, which links most-favored-nation [MFN] status for the Soviet Union to improved emigration levels, as well as the Stevenson amendment, which prohibits the reduction of tariffs on Soviet goods imported into the United States. These two laws were enacted in 1974 in an effort to press Moscow into relaxing restrictions on Jews desiring to emigrate.

Already some progress has been made, but much more could be done. I believe that this resolution sends the right signal at the right time, and I hope that the Soviet Union's desire for increased trade and improved international public opinion will contribute to a far more liberal treatment of Soviet Jews and other dissidents.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House considered and approved House Concurrent Resolution 34 that expresses our formal and very serious concerns about the continuing record of human rights abuses by

the Soviet Government. I was very pleased by the support that the resolution received and I am also pleased that we are taking a few minutes this afternoon to underline the importance of the international campaign to help Soviet Jews and the cause of human rights.

Over the years, I have participated in many special orders and other efforts in behalf of Soviet Jewry and I am delighted to know that many of the new Members are participating with us today. I think all of us are heartened by some of the reports that we are now getting out of the Soviet Union. I hope very much that the reports are true and that significant numbers of Jews will be permitted to leave and that the systematic repression of those who remain in the U.S.S.R. will be eased. But my optimism is tempered by my experience with the terrible record of repression and restricted emigration that has prevailed for many years and which has been particularly bad for more than 6 years. There is, in short, the potential for good news. But it has not happened yet and we must continue to make it very clear to the Russians and the entire world that the people of this country are a part of the struggle for basic human rights in the Soviet Union. That is what we are doing today in the House and I am proud of our consistent record of support for Soviet Jewry and the cause of international human rights.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, condemning Soviet violation of international human rights obligations.

The Soviet disregard for the individual is evidenced in several forms, including religious suppression. Citizens are regularly placed in horrendous psychiatric institutions for engaging in "religious activities"; government officials describe religious belief as symptomatic of mental illness.

The Soviet Union's record on emigration is deplorable. Recent publicized releases, while encouraging, must not divert our attention from the overall dismal outlook for the political and religious prisoners seeking to emigrate.

Nowhere is the blatant Soviet disregard for human rights so forcefully illustrated as by their massive use of forced labor, the largest such system in the world. The Soviets continue to use slave labor as the backbone of their trade and economy. Not only should Members support this resolution, but I urge my colleagues to join in signing a letter to the President urging him to end the importation of goods made by slave labor.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, which reminds us of the continued violations by the Soviet Union of its international human rights obligations, especially its violations of the right to emigrate.

In recent days, and weeks, and months, the Soviet Government has sought to inform the United States of its new policy of glasnost, or openness. Mr. Speaker, we would all welcome the opening of Soviet society, and none would welcome it more than the 400,000 Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate and on whose behalf I speak today.

If this openness is the beginning of a change in the emigration policies of the Soviet Union, I welcome it. But the Soviet Govern-

ment must be continually reminded that only real change can overcome this stumbling block in United States-Soviet relations. The end of exile for a few well-known dissidents, the reunification of a few families, the release of a few political prisoners is commendable, but not enough.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Soviet Union and its leader, Mr. Gorbachev, to live up to its obligations under the universal declaration of human rights, the International Covenants of Human Rights, and the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to release all prisoners of conscience, to unite all divided families, and to permit all "refuseniks" and others who wish to emigrate to do so.

Sometimes a number like 400,000 seems very distant, very impersonal, so I would like to focus on just one person who is affected by the Soviet disregard for its human rights treaty obligations: Vladimir Tulovsky. Vladimir Tulovsky lives in Moscow with his wife, Galina, and their three children. They have been applying for repatriation to Israel every year since 1976. Although he is a qualified instructor in physical mathematics, Mr. Tulovsky has been forced to give up his job and to work beneath his professional capacity. Each time he reapplies for a visa, he loses his job and must search for another one.

What does the Soviet Union have to gain from forcing the Tulovskys to remain in the Soviet Union when their hearts are in Israel? Mr. Speaker, let us hope that today we can make it clear to the Soviet Government that there may be much to gain in improved United States-Soviet relations if the Tulovskys and others like them are given the basic human rights of freedom to emigrate.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, which strongly protests continuing Soviet human rights violations.

During recent months, we have heard much from the Soviet Union about their new policy of glasnost, or openness. We have even seen some of this talk backed up by the release of a number of prominent Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience and other human rights activists. However, we should not allow ourselves to be misled. The Soviet Union's words are promising. Some of their recent actions are encouraging. We can remain hopeful. Yet, the Soviet's history of human rights violations, particularly against their Jewish citizens, has been too dismal for too long to think that the situation could possibly be reversed in the dramatic fashion the Soviets have suggested.

Consider, for example, that there are some 3.5 million Soviet Jews. Approximately 400,000 have applied to emigrate, and 20,000 Soviet Jews have been refused the right to emigrate at least once. Less than 1,000 were allowed to emigrate in 1986.

These are vivid reminders of the Soviet's atrocious human rights record, as are the annual observances of independence anniversaries in captive Soviet-bloc nations, where repression and human rights abuses are commonplace. All of this in total disregard of the numerous international agreements, which the Soviet Union has signed, guaranteeing the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution seeks to remind the Soviet Union that we are interested in more than mere words. They have much to prove and, frankly, I was heartened to see in today's Washington Post an article painting a very optimistic picture of future human rights policies in the Soviet Union, particularly with regard to the treatment of Soviet Jews. The source of this favorable information is Morris B. Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and a respected figure on these matters. I am hopeful Mr. Abram is correct in his assessment of the human rights situation in the Soviet Union and I know my colleagues join me in expressing that sentiment.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the full text of the Washington Post article detailing Mr. Abram's views:

**JEWISH LEADER PREDICTS SOVIETS WILL LET THOUSANDS EMIGRATE**

(By John M. Goshko)

An American Jewish leader predicted yesterday that the Soviet Union will permit thousands of Jews to emigrate to Israel this year on direct air flights via the Soviets East-bloc ally Romania, and will increase substantially Jewish religious and cultural freedom for those who remain.

This prediction was made by Morris B. Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, who had extensive talks with Soviet officials in Moscow last week. Abram and Edgar Bronfman, chairman of the World Jewish Congress, went to the Soviet capital on behalf of major Jewish organizations in the United States and other Western countries.

In a telephone interview yesterday, Abram said he and Bronfman "believe we were reassured" that the Soviets, as part of their new policy of glasnost or openness, will once again permit large-scale Jewish emigration, which ended in 1980. He added that he expects nearly all the estimated 11,000 long-term "refuseniks," whose previous applications to leave have been rejected, to be free to go within the year.

A new system of direct emigration from the Soviet Union to Tel Aviv via Romania will have the effect of satisfying a long-standing Israeli request that Jewish emigres from the Soviet Union be brought directly to Israel. They would lose the option they have enjoyed in the past to request refugee status in the United States or other Western countries once they arrived in Vienna, until now their first landing place in the West.

The Reagan administration and many U.S. Jewish leaders have opposed steps that would coerce Soviet Jews to go to Israel, though American Jewish groups have endorsed the concept of direct flights to Tel Aviv.

A senior State Department official said yesterday that the administration's policy is "to open up choices for people, not close them down." He said the U.S. government would have to take "a close look" before committing its support to any plan that might foreclose the rights of Soviet Jews.

But several Jewish leaders familiar with the negotiations said an agreement to allow several thousand new emigres to leave was worth some limits on where the emigres could go. They noted that the emigres could apply from Israel to come to the United States, though they would then be counted against a quota for Israeli citizens, thou-

sands of whom are already waiting for permission to come to the United States.

If the system described by Abram does go into effect, emigres arriving in Israel directly from the Soviet Union would lose the refugee status that entitles them to enter the United States, because they would be regarded as Israeli citizens the moment they arrived. As a result, only those with relatives in the United States could claim refugee status under U.S. law.

In a reference to this problem, Abram said yesterday that the Soviets will permit so-called "first-degree relatives"—people with a father, mother, child or sibling in another country—to emigrate for "family reunification purposes."

"We have the impression that there may be considerable flexibility in the interpretation of 'first-degree relationship,'" Abram added. "We were told that the term 'family,' as defined in Soviet regulations, derives from their law governing domestic matters and was not designed to be restrictive in emigration matters."

Abram said that procedures will be established for reviewing the cases of refuseniks who were denied permission to emigrate. He said it was his impression that the Soviets will hold back only those refuseniks who are involved in Soviet national security questions, and he added that a system will be established to appeal adverse decisions "as far up as the Supreme Soviet."

In describing anticipated domestic policy shifts by Soviet authorities, Abram said he understood that "all Jewish religious books from any source may be imported into the Soviet Union," that a kosher restaurant may be opened in Moscow and ritual slaughtering to produce kosher meat will be allowed more freely, that "synagogues will be opened in all sites where there is a demonstrated need," that applicants for rabbinical training will be allowed to leave the country for the requisite studies and that "the teaching of Hebrew to children in school or synagogue," which now is banned, will be "restudied along with similar restrictions on other religious groups."

Speaking for both Bronfman and himself, Abram concluded:

"We now await Soviet performance of all these fronts, for only then are we prepared to say that glasnost is a real process and that it includes Jews."

He said that if the Soviets make good on these understandings, American Jews are prepared to respond "on a parallel basis to the degree that we can produce it" to help the Soviets improve their relations with Washington and to win waivers on a year-to-year basis for restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union.

Abram declined to identify the Soviet officials with whom he and Bronfman spoke, except to say that they represented "the highest levels of the government and the Soviet Communist Party." He would not comment on reports that Anatoly Dobrynin, a former ambassador here and a key adviser to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, played a major role in the Moscow talks.

About 500 Jews have received exit visas this month—five times the monthly rate of last year but far below the number of visas granted in the late 1970s.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 34, legislation I have cosponsored that establishes as a priority of the 100th Congress efforts to support the restoration of emigration rights for Jews living in the Soviet Union.



This resolution strongly protests the Soviet Union's continuing violations of a number of international human rights accords, including the Helsinki final act, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenants on Human Rights. These agreements obligate signatory nations, including the Soviet Union, to respect basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of religion and the freedom of speech.

Among the most notable Soviet violations of these rights are new, restrictive regulations that prohibit Soviet Jews from emigrating to Israel, the United States, or other Western nations where they will be permitted to worship freely. Thousands of Soviet Jews have petitioned the government to approve their emigration requests, yet last year Soviet authorities allowed only 914 Jews to emigrate, the second lowest annual number in the past 20 years.

The denial of these requests to leave the country has been accompanied by increased Soviet efforts to harass and punish Jewish officials in the Soviet Union who lead efforts to study and celebrate their cultural heritage.

For a number of years, I have spoken out in support of our Nation's efforts to exert pressure on Soviet leaders to eliminate this persecution of Soviet Jews. While these efforts have met with mixed results, the more than 400,000 Soviet Jews who have indicated a desire to emigrate are aware of our support for their efforts and continue to remain hopeful that someday they will be able to worship freely in the land of their choice.

Early signals by General Secretary Gorbachev indicated that the Soviet attitude toward emigration rights for Soviet Jews might be changing. With the exception of a few well publicized cases, however, the Soviets continue to deny emigration rights to Jews seeking to relocate, especially to prisoners of conscience, divided families, and refuseniks.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 34 sends a signal that Soviet leaders could achieve an important measure of credibility by living up to public statements that they are serious about opening their society up to observe many of the basic human rights and values that they have denied the Soviet people for many years. Soviet actions in the next few months, especially efforts to free thousands of Jews to emigrate, will be an important test of Soviet resolve and sincerity as we contemplate potential lasting and far-reaching negotiations on nuclear weapons and military forces.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank and commend the gentleman from Florida for his hard work and leadership as the first chairman of the Helsinki Commission, of which I am now a member under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland. My further compliments to Mr. FASCELL as present chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and for his efforts in bringing this bill to the floor in record time.

The name Natan Sharansky is synonymous with the concept of freedom and dignity of the human spirit. Natan is symbolic of the struggle of the repressed religious, ethnic, and political minorities in the Soviet Union. Today, at a Helsinki Commission hearing, I had the pleasure and great honor of meeting Irina Ratu-

shinskaya, who has been called the female Natan Sharansky, and rightly so. Irina is a poet, who was sentenced to 7 years of hard labor for her poetry and her commitment to human rights. One of her most notorious criminal acts was the open letter she wrote on behalf of Andrei Sakharov, whom she and her contemporaries consider to be the last of the first generation of human rights activists. Like Natan, Irina was brutally tortured for her beliefs, and for her continued refusal to renounce these beliefs.

Irina and Natan are two individuals who have been permitted to emigrate, after many years, much suffering, and a tremendous pressure from the West. There are nearly 4,000 political prisoners and prisoners of conscience still in jail in the Soviet Union. Nearly half a million more individuals have formally applied to emigrate.

These numbers attest to the fact that the Soviet Union has consistently failed to comply with the Helsinki Final Act of 1975. The conditions of the vast majority of political and religious dissidents have not improved, and the emigration numbers remain very low.

One cannot look at this situation without being reminded that this is the bicentennial year of the U.S. Constitution. This document was written by and for Americans. Our bill of rights, however, is a Declaration of Independence which sets forth certain inalienable rights which apply to all people. God who gives life gives freedom; freedom is one of the inalienable rights which belong to all human beings, American or Soviet, African or Asian, Christian or Jew.

It is our privilege to live in a free society, just as it is our obligation to ensure that others are free. To ensure that others are permitted to enjoy their inalienable rights, and their rights under international agreements, is our moral and our legal duty.

That is why this bill, House Concurrent Resolution 34 is so important. We are expressing the outrage of Congress and the people we represent that blatant violations of the Helsinki Final Act and of individual rights are permitted to continue. Instead of opening up their borders, the Soviets are tightening them further. In January, the emigration laws were codified and made more restrictive, in defiance of international agreements and basic human rights.

I join my colleagues in calling for compliance by the Soviet Union of the Helsinki Final Act and of the tenets of the bill of rights. Failure to comply constitutes a serious obstacle to meaningful dialog between the Soviet Union and the United States, and between the Soviet Union and all other nations who recognize the inalienable rights of all people.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 34, the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### COMMENDING THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TREATY OF ROME

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 121) to commend the European Community and the government of the member States of the European Community for the role which the Community has played in the development of the close relationship existing between the United States and Europe on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Community.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. Res. 121

Whereas the extensive destruction caused by World War II and the immediate postwar need for economic and political recovery persuaded major European statesmen, such as Sir Winston Churchill, Robert Schuman, and Jean Monnet, to advocate a united Europe;

Whereas on March 25, 1957, the six member states of the European Coal and Steel Community—the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—signed a treaty in Rome to establish a customs union and to create a framework to promote the free movement of people, services, and capital among the member states, to support agricultural growth, and to create a common transport policy;

Whereas the European Community was expanded with the addition of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland in 1973, Greece in 1981, and Spain and Portugal in 1986, making the European Community a body of twelve countries with a population of over three hundred and twenty million people and a total Gross Domestic Product of nearly \$2,700,000,000;

Whereas as a unit, the European Community is the largest trading partner of the

United States, with a total two-way trade of \$125,000,000,000 and United States direct investment in the Community totaling \$81,500,000,000, which generates goods and services worth over \$400,000,000,000 annually.

Whereas the European Community is working to complete the objectives established in the Treaty of Rome to eliminate economic and physical barriers and to increase political cooperation among its member states in order to further the goal of a United Europe;

Whereas the European Community has contributed to the prosperity and democratic values of its member countries and to the development of a peaceful Europe through reduction of historical tensions and rivalries, which has enabled the European Community to become an important voice in world affairs; and

Whereas the United States had consistently supported the objective of European unity and the enlargement of the European Community as desirable developments which promote prosperity, world peace, and democracy, and which contribute to the strengthening of the vital relationship between the United States and the nations of Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the great significance of the Treaty of Rome on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of its signing.

(2) commends the European Community and the nations which are members of the European Community for the positive role which the Community has played in the growth, development, and prosperity of postwar Europe; and

(3) acknowledge the vital role of the European Community in the development of the close and mutually beneficial relationship that exists between the United States and Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 121 commending the European Community and the governments of the member states of the European Community for the role which the Community has played in the development of the close relationship existing between the United States and Europe on the occasion of the signing of the Treaty of Rome.

Mr. Speaker, after World War II some of the finest minds in Europe recognized the great need to unite Europe, and begin the rebuilding process in a cooperative, unified manner. The Treaty of Rome, which was signed on March 25, 1957, by the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, established a framework to promote the free movement of people, services, and capital among the six member

states, and to support agricultural growth and create a common transport policy.

The European Community was further expanded in 1973, 1981, and 1986 to include the United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland, Greece, Spain, and Portugal. The European Community as a unit, is the largest trading partner of the United States, and has worked diligently to eliminate economic and physical barriers to trade, and further the various goals of a united Europe.

The objective of a unified Europe has been one that we in Congress, and the United States as a whole, have supported throughout the years. A continued strong relationship between the United States and our European allies should be high on the list of U.S. foreign policy priorities. We commend our allies on their dedication to a unified Europe and congratulate them on the 30th anniversary of the creation of the European Community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

□ 1530

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was 30 years ago in the city of Rome that the nations of Europe first came together to try to build a United States of Europe. Having just survived the devastation of the Second World War, a group of giants, European statesmen, Winston Churchill, Robert Schuman, Jean Monnet, Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, Paul Henri Spaak of Belgium, decided that the centuries of bloodshed and hatred and bitterness that characterized Europe must come to an end, and to do so they must form first an economic and eventually a political union to pool their enormous resources and talents for the benefit of their people.

There were many skeptics, Mr. Speaker, when the European Community was born. On the 25th of March, 1957, six States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed a treaty which was politically a customs union encompassing these six. In 1973, the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland joined the Community. Greece did so in 1981 and Spain and Portugal last year.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the European Community is a body of 12 countries with a population of over 320 million people, a gross domestic product of almost \$3 trillion. It is the largest aggregation of free and democratic societies on the face of this planet.

The European Community is the largest trading partner of the United States. Two-way trade amounts to about \$125 billion a year. We have invested over \$80 billion in the European Community.

Now we have some problems with the Community from time to time, on agricultural policy, on trade policy. On many issues occasionally we do not agree, but I think it is critical for all of us to understand that on the funda-

mental commitment to freedom, independence, a growing economic relationship, and most importantly the preservation of human rights, both within our respective nations and in the world at large, we are at one with the European Community.

It was 30 years ago that this historic treaty was signed, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate for Members of Congress to congratulate our friends in the European Community, to tell them that they have done the job well, to tell them that we wish them further success, and to indicate to them that we are looking forward to the further expansion of the European Community itself.

A number of nations on the periphery of our own are knocking on the door asking for admission. It is our policy to encourage this growth, because we know that in Europe, in unity there is strength, and while there are some favorable signs emanating from the Soviet Union, we must always be on guard and expand and strengthen the free nations of Western Europe.

The Congress of the United States, Mr. Speaker, has established a permanent delegation to the European Economic Community, and my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN], and I serve as cochairmen of the U.S. Congressional Delegation to the European Parliament. We meet with our European counterparts twice a year in serious, lengthy, businesslike sessions in an open and free give and take as befits friends. We shall be having our next meeting just within a couple of weeks, and we have a long agenda of items on which we disagree, but we shall approach this meeting as we approach every one of our encounters, with a spirit of friendship and openness and compromise, because we know that the issues that bind us together are infinitely more important than the issues that separate us.

So, on this 30th anniversary of the European Community, we salute the giants who were intellectual genesis of the European Community two generations ago. We salute the leaders of the European Community who today provide it with the leadership and the courage and the vision to move ahead, and we wish the 320 million free citizens of these 12 democratic nations prosperity, peace, and working together with all democratic nations on the face of this planet.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 121, to commend, on the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, the European Community, and the member states of the European Community, for the role Community has played in the develop-



ment of a close relationship between the United States and Europe.

This resolution is sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], the chairman of the U.S. congressional delegation which meets twice yearly with a delegation from the European Parliament and I commend Mr. LANTOS for his outstanding leadership. It is cosponsored by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], as cochairmen of our delegation.

Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1987 is the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, marking the beginning of a bold political experiment—the European Community. Beginning as a customs union and a framework for the promotion of the free movement of people, services, and capital among states, and to rationalize agricultural and transport policy among six states, it has now grown to cover the bulk of Western Europe with a framework for political and cultural cooperation, as well.

The European Community has become a voice for democratic values around the world. It has become an experiment in the separation of powers and democracy on a continental scale, with power allocated among a council of ministers, a commission, and a directly elected European Parliament.

We may have our political and trade differences with the European Community from time to time, Mr. Speaker, but we can all agree that its development is a healthy thing. A fair challenge from free peoples is a challenge we should, and can, rise to. We have much more in common than those issues which divide us.

Accordingly, I am delighted to join in supporting this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I hope our colleagues will support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 30th anniversary of the beginning of the European Economic Community—an important trade partner of the United States.

Before the House votes on Resolution 121 commending the EC, I would like Members to consider with me the relationship that has developed between the Community and American agriculture.

The EC has made good on its express commitment to encourage the development of European agriculture. Since 1974, EC ag exports to the United States have grown from \$1 billion to over \$3.5 billion in 1985, U.S. ag exports to the EC, however, dropped nearly 50 percent in the few short years between 1980 and 1985. Soybean

exports to the EC in 1985 were less than half of 1982 exports.

Feed grains have fared even worse. 1985 exports to the EC are only one quarter of 1981 figures.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the European Community is mounting a strong challenge to the American farming community. The EC is built on taking unfair advantage of international markets.

How have they accomplished all this in such short time? A host of import protections and export subsidies have enabled the EC to drastically reduce the ability of the American farmer to compete fairly for its share of the world market—depressing prices, causing enormous surpluses and expensive storage problems for the American industry.

Furthermore, the EC has signaled its intention to deepen this crisis by taxing the consumption of soybean products. This tax would amount to almost 90 percent of the current price of soybean oil. This tax is blatantly inconsistent with EC commitments in both the general agreements on tariffs and trade as well as a commitment they made as far back as 1962 to restrict duties on soybean products.

Along with several other Members, I have cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 51, encouraging the President to ensure that this tax is not established and to impress upon the EC the importance of adhering to their previous commitments restricting duties on soybean products.

As a member from an agricultural district in Iowa, I cannot, in good conscience, support this bill commending the European Community whose success has come at the expense of the American farmer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this resolution and call on the European Community to recommit itself to fair trade thereby renewing the economic relationship which both the United States and the European Community deserve.

□ 1540

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GRANDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the excellent statement being made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY]. I agree most heartily with what he has to say.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] yield?

Mr. GRANDY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in large measure, I find myself in agreement with my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] and I only wish he could have been with us during the

very heated discussions we had with our European friends on their common agricultural policy, which in many ways has been protectionist; in many ways the imposition of barriers in the way of American agricultural exports to the European Community has been noted by us, criticized by us, and fought against.

I think my friend will agree with me that economic relations among free nations is not a love boat. Economic relations between free nations are always contentious; we fight and dispute, and they have complained against many of our policies and we have complaints against many of their policies.

I think it is important that the gentleman make his point, but I am sure he made it in a spirit of good will vis-à-vis the European Economic Community, because it is our single most important democratic trading partner. Many of its nations are our NATO allies, and between the United States and the European Economic Community, we represent the bulk of the free and democratic societies on the face of this planet.

So while I think it is singularly appropriate to indicate shortcomings in the policies of the European Community, the overriding issue is our common goal of recognizing that both they and we wish to live in free economies and in a free society, promoting our own and everyone else's economic growth.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to respond to my friend from California [Mr. LANTOS] and concur with him. This is an economic argument we have; not a political one, not a philosophical one.

My problem with the language in this resolution are statements to support agricultural growth, which means the common agricultural policy which means a lot of problems for a lot of producers in Iowa; and the enlargement of the European Community as desirable developments which promote prosperity.

Well, unfortunately, the give and take right now is clearly working against some of us in the Upper Midwest. The gentleman is correct, I do wish to be on record as opposing the economic provisions of this resolution, but support him in his political endeavors, and admire his ability to bring this to the floor and have a discussion about it today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say I rise very strongly to support the point of view just stated by our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

I want to say at the outset that I have nothing but the highest regard for my colleague from California [Mr. LANTOS] and for the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and have supported them in most of the things that they have tried to accomplish in this body, and proud to do so.

Let me say, speaking on behalf of an agricultural district, I must disagree most strongly with the thrust of this resolution; and let me say in response to a statement by the gentleman from California, I have good will for the Nation-States of Europe that are our friends and our trading partners and our allies.

My good will toward the European Economic Community has been exhausted and replaced with the frustration and the bitterness that all the people in my part of the country feel about that community.

The political trappings of the Treaty of Rome are largely ceremonial. The European Parliament is hardly a center of power, and the treaty never led to the political unification of Europe as was its hope in those lofty days when it was launched.

The real significance of the treaty, thus, lies in the economic structure it created; and the strongest, indeed in many respects the only significant part of that structure is the most offensive part from our standpoint, and that is the common agricultural policy. The CAP has undoubtedly benefited France's farmers, but we can leave such commemorations to the French parliament, I would suggest.

The reality for American farmers is quite different. They have lost billions of dollars in exports, through the extension of protectionist barriers and the use of predatory trade subsidies by the European Community.

The recent accession of Spain and Portugal into the EEC—something this resolution commemorates—is a fitting case in point. When Spain and Portugal joined the Community, they moved behind an iron curtain of import protection. The feed grain market that took us decades to develop were lost in a moment to the protectionist laws of the Community.

The Europeans say that we received compensation for these levies. Protracted negotiations did allow us continued access to 50 percent of our previous markets, but losing half your market is hardly just compensation. It is certainly not something that we should commemorate in a resolution.

The Community does not specialize in protectionism alone. Besides cutting off our sales in Europe, the Community also has used the common agricultural policy to dump its excess produc-

tion, robbing our farmers of important markets in North Africa and Eastern Europe.

Predatory subsidies have become a hallmark of the EC's policy.

This resolution also commemorates consistent U.S. support for "the enlargement of the European Community." Looking at the accession of Spain and Portugal, and the loss of agricultural markets that ensued, I hardly see why we should support the extension of this protectionist monstrosity to countries like Morocco, Algeria or Norway. It would result in an even greater loss of our agricultural markets.

The European Community is waging a one-sided trade war on our farmers, ignoring GATT and using the common agricultural policy to protect their own markets, while they dump in markets that we have traditionally supplied.

With the opening of the new GATT round in Uruguay, it is time to wage war on the levies and subsidies that define agricultural policy in the European Community. It is time to push for the dismantling of the common agricultural policy so that we can put our farmers back on a level playing field.

All of us commend the original goals and ideals of the European Economic Community, but I would say that those goals and ideals have become warped as increasing percentages of the resources of the Community have been dumped into this monstrosity they call the common agricultural policy.

As long as that defines the reality of the EEC, I must say I believe it is inappropriate to pass this kind of resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I can only comment that our delegation to the European Economic Community is usually unanimous in denouncing the European Community's common agricultural policy, which has been a counterproductive policy of artificially stimulating overproduction in Europe resulting in predatory trade practices elsewhere.

□ 1550

But having said that, I still would like to redirect my friend's attention to what the European Community is. My colleague complained about Spain and Portugal being admitted to the European Community. I need not remind him that both Spain and Portugal, not too many years ago, were fascist dictatorships. Today they are free political democracies with functioning parliaments, free press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom to travel. This would not come about without the strengthening impact of a large and growing Western

Europe. I think it is important even for our friends from some other parts of the country to realize that the parochial view will not help Europe change its agricultural policies. We will have to work with them not against them.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for his concern. Let me make two points.

First of all, we all have an interest in a strong and growing Western Europe for just the reasons that the gentleman has cited. I would argue that increasingly European observers are saying though that the way the European Community is functioning with increasing percentage of its resources going into the common agricultural policy, the EEC itself is on the verge of not being the boon to economic growth in Europe that it should be.

Furthermore, the reason that I am making the point so strongly is that we are trying, I know that the gentleman has been trying to influence the common agricultural policy; my feeling about the resolution that we are passing today, although I know it comes from only the best of intentions, so does everything the gentleman does—and I mean that with the utmost sincerity—is that it sends to them the wrong signal. The only signal that I want to send to the European Community is change the common agricultural policy. Anything that blurs that message, in my judgment, is detrimental.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Speaker, I shall personally deliver to our friends in the European Community a copy of the eloquent statement of my friend from Minnesota and my friend from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] so they will not miss the signal.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to have us bear in mind that we do have many common interests between the United States and the European Community. While we do have distinct trade differences and differences with regard to agricultural policies, that with regard to the security of the West, with regard to terrorism, with regard to narcotics, with regard to our condemnation of aggression by the Soviets in various regional conflicts, we find a great deal of support in the European Community. I hope that we will not be shortsighted as we criticize the European Community for some of their agricultural policies, that we do not forget the more important aspects of the commonality of our common interests and working together on the most important issues.



Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution to commend the European Community on its 30th anniversary.

Forty years ago the United States of America established the Marshall plan to rebuild a Europe devastated by war. America helped the Europeans to help themselves. Thirty years ago, with the Treaty of Rome, the European states united their economies to produce a single, healthy European economy. That treaty was the greatest proof of the success of America's Marshall plan.

The unity of the economies of Europe has benefited the European states and has led to increased political and defense cooperation that benefits the Western alliance. The Treaty of Rome reflected the great strength of Western democracy.

America should send its hearty congratulations to the countries of Europe on the memorable occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome.

I urge my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and pass the resolution to commend our European allies.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 121.

The question was taken.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 121, the resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### BIG CYPRESS NATIONAL PRESERVE ADDITION

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 184) to establish the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition in the State of Florida, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H.R. 184

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Big Cypress National Preserve Addition Act".

(b) AMENDMENT OF BIG CYPRESS NATIONAL PRESERVE ACT.—Whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to the Act of October 11, 1974, such amendment shall be considered to be made to the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Big Cypress National Preserve in the State of Florida, and for other purposes", approved October 11, 1974 (88 Stat. 1258; 16 U.S.C. 698f and following).

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress as follows:

(1) The planned construction of Interstate 75 is presently being designed in such a way as to improve the natural water flow to the Everglades National Park, which has been disrupted by State Road 84 (commonly known as "Alligator Alley").

(2) The planned construction of Interstate 75 provides an opportunity to enhance protection of the Everglades National Park, to promote protection of the endangered Florida panther, and to provide for public recreational use and enjoyment of public lands by expanding the Big Cypress National Preserve to include those lands adjacent to Interstate 75 in Collier County north and east of the Big Cypress National Preserve, west of the Broward County line, and south of the Hendry County line.

(3) The Federal acquisition of lands bordering the Big Cypress National Preserve in conjunction with the construction of Interstate 75 would provide significant public benefits by limiting development pressure on lands which are important both in terms of fish and wildlife habitat supporting endangered species and of wetlands which are the headwaters of the Big Cypress National Preserve.

(4) Public ownership of lands adjacent to the Big Cypress National Preserve would enhance the protection of the Everglades National Park while providing recreational opportunities and other public uses currently offered by the Big Cypress National Preserve.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to establish the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition.

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF ADDITION.

(a) ADDITION.—The Act of October 11, 1974, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

#### "SEC. 9. BIG CYPRESS NATIONAL PRESERVE ADDITION."

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to—

"(1) achieve the purposes of the first section of this Act;

"(2) complete the preserve in conjunction with the planned construction of Interstate Highway 75; and

"(3) insure appropriately managed use and access to the Big Cypress Watershed in the State of Florida; the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition is established.

"(b) MAP AND BOUNDARIES.—The Big Cypress National Preserve Addition (referred to in this Act as the 'Addition') shall comprise approximately 136,000 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled Big Cypress National Preserve Addition, dated June, 1986, and numbered 176-91000B, which shall be on file and available for

public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., and shall be filed with appropriate offices of Collier County in the State of Florida. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, publish a detailed description of the boundaries of the Addition in the Federal Register.

"(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The area within the boundaries depicted on the map referred to in subsection (b) shall be known as the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition and shall be managed in accordance with section 4.

"(d) COMPLETION OF ACQUISITION.—For purposes of administering the Addition and notwithstanding section 2(c), it is the express intent of the Congress that the Secretary should substantially complete the land acquisition program contemplated with respect to the Addition within 5 years after the date of the enactment of this section."

(b) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—Section 5 of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended by inserting "and the Addition" after "preserve" each place it appears.

"(c) SUITABILITY AS WILDERNESS.—Section 7 of the act of October 11, 1974, is amended—

(1) by inserting "with respect to the preserve and 5 years from the date of the enactment of the Big Cypress National Preserve Addition Act with respect to the Addition" after "date of the enactment of this Act" in the first sentence; and

(2) by inserting "or the area within the Addition (as the case may be)" after "preserve" each place it appears.

(d) INDIAN RIGHTS.—Section 6 of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended as follows:

(1) In clause (i) insert "and the Addition" after "preserve" and insert "(January 1, 1985, in the case of the Addition)" after "1972".

(2) In clause (ii) insert "or within the Addition" after "preserve".

#### SEC. 4. ACQUISITION OF LAND WITHIN ADDITION.

(a) UNITED STATES SHARE OF ACQUISITION COSTS.—The first section of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The aggregate cost to the United States of acquiring lands within the Addition may not exceed 80 percent of the total cost of such lands.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), if the State of Florida transfers to the Secretary lands within the Addition, the Secretary shall pay to or reimburse the State of Florida (out of funds appropriated for such purpose) an amount equal to 80 percent of the total costs to the State of Florida of acquiring such lands.

"(3) The amount described in paragraph (2) shall be reduced by an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of the total cost incurred by the Secretary in acquiring lands in the Addition other than from the State of Florida.

"(4) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'total cost' means that amount of the total acquisition costs (including the value of exchanged or donated lands) less the amount of the costs incurred by the Federal Highway Administration and the Florida Department of Transportation, including severance damages paid to private property owners as a result of the construction of Interstate 75."

(b) METHODS OF LAND ACQUISITION IN THE ADDITION.—The first sentence of subsection (c) of the first section of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or the Addition" after "preserve" the first place it appears; and  
(2) in the first proviso—

(A) by inserting "in the preserve" after "subdivisions,"; and

(B) by striking out the colon and inserting in lieu thereof "and, any land acquired by the State of Florida, or any of its subdivisions, in the Addition shall be acquired in accordance with subsection (d):".

(c) VALUATION AND APPRAISAL.—The fourth sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "or the Addition" after "preserve" each place it appears.

(d) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS BY THE STATE OF FLORIDA.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to interfere with the right of the State of Florida to acquire such property rights as may be necessary for Interstate 75."

(e) EXCLUSION OF SUBSURFACE ESTATE.—The second and third sentences of subsection (c) of such section are each amended by inserting "and the Addition" after "preserve" each place it appears.

(f) IMPROVED PROPERTY IN ADDITION.—Section 3(b) of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (i) by inserting "with respect to the preserve and January 1, 1986, with respect to the Addition" after "November 23, 1971,"; and

(2) in paragraph (ii)—

(A) by inserting "with respect to the preserve and January 1, 1986, with respect to the Addition" after "November 23, 1971," the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting "or January 1, 1986, as the case may be," after "November 23, 1971" the second and third places it appears.

#### SEC. 5. COOPERATION AMONG AGENCIES.

The Act of October 11, 1974, if further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

#### "SEC. 10. COOPERATION AMONG AGENCIES.

"The Secretary and other involved Federal agencies shall cooperate with the State of Florida to establish recreational access points and roads, rest and recreation areas, appropriate wildlife protection, and, where appropriate, hunting, fishing, frogging, and other recreational opportunities in conjunction with the creation of the Addition and in the construction of Interstate Highway 75. Not more than 3 of such access points shall be located within the preserve (including the Addition)."

#### SEC. 6. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Act of October 11, 1974, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

#### "SEC. 11. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

"Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a detailed report on, and further plan for, the preserve and Addition. The report and further plan shall include each of the following:

"(1) The status of the existing preserve, the effectiveness of past regulation and management of the preserve, and recommendations for future management of the preserve and the Addition.

"(2) The need for involvement of other Federal and State agencies to accomplish the objectives of the preserve and Addition.

"(3) The status of land acquisition.

"(4) A determination, made in conjunction with the State of Florida, of the adequacy of the number, location, and design of the recreational access points on Interstate 75

(Alligator Alley) for access to the Big Cypress National Preserve, including the Addition.

The determination referred to in paragraph (4) shall incorporate the results of any related studies of the State of Florida Department of Transportation and other Florida State agencies. Any recommendation for significant changes in the approved recreational access points, including any proposed additions, shall be accompanied by an assessment of the environmental impact of such changes."

#### SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 8 of the Act of October 11, 1974, is amended—

(1) by striking out "There" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), there"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) ADDITION.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for acquisition of lands and for development within the Addition."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 184 was introduced by our colleague Tom Lewis, with cosponsorship of the entire Florida congressional delegation. The bill would modify the boundaries of the Big Cypress National Preserve to add lands important to the ecological well-being of the southwest Florida region.

Big Cypress National Preserve presently consists of about 575,000 acres, abutting Everglades National Park on the north. The preserve is an extension of the unique ecosystem of the everglades, containing large numbers of plant and animal species found nowhere else in North America, including 21 rare or endangered species.

The land to be included in the addition will accomplish several important purposes, namely, enhanced protection of the water supplies that the Everglades National Park and the southwest Florida region are dependent upon; the preservation of prime endangered species habitat; and enhanced public recreational opportunities. The land in question is bisected by "Alligator Alley," a State highway that runs across the southern tip of

Florida which is in the process of being upgraded to become a section of Interstate 75. Because of the upgrading from a State highway to an interstate segment, we have a unique opportunity to leverage highway severance funds with Federal and State appropriations, to acquire lands that will protect critical water areas and the habitat for the endangered Florida panther.

With the upgrading of Interstate 75, funds provided through the highway trust fund will be used to pay 60 percent of the value of the surface rights for 88,000 acres of the proposed addition to the preserve. H.R. 184 provides that the remaining 40 percent would be funded on the basis of 80 percent from the Federal Government and 20 percent by the State of Florida. The remaining 48,000 acres to be added to the preserve would likewise be funded on an 80-20 split between the Federal Government and the State of Florida.

The 136,000 total acres added to the preserve by H.R. 184 would be managed in the same manner as the existing preserve to provide for the protection of this unique ecosystem and to provide for recreation use, including fishing and hunting. Subsurface rights would be retained by private owners and exploration and development of any mineral or oil and gas would be permitted under the same authorities and in the same manner as provided in the 1974 act establishing the Big Cypress Preserve.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is identical to legislation we considered and passed in the House last year. The inclusion of the Big Cypress addition lands carries with it, what I believe is a broad bipartisan consensus. While there is some question of effecting a land exchange to deal with part of the land included in the addition, I want to point out to Members that the legislation before us does not preclude such an exchange. If, and when, such an exchange can be worked out, I am sure the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be receptive to its consideration, but I do not believe we should delay the addition of critical lands to the preserve on the basis of an exchange that may or may not come about. The Big Cypress National Preserve Addition and the proposed land exchange can each stand on their own merits and be judged.

I support the addition of these critical lands to the Big Cypress National Preserve and urge the adoption of H.R. 184.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 184. This bill would authorize a 136,000-acre addition to the Big Cy-



press National Preserve in southern Florida. It is identical to legislation passed by the House last year which did not receive final action in the Senate.

H.R. 184 provides the Federal Government with a unique opportunity to acquire and protect this important addition, without paying full value for the land. Due to the proposed conversion of Alligator Alley to Interstate 75 later this year, highway severance funds can be utilized to pay a major portion of the acquisition costs. The additional expenditures would be cost-shared by the Federal and State Governments, 80 and 20 percent, respectively.

Acquisition of this area will preserve the wetland areas which serve as important fish and wildlife habitat and also as recharge sources for southern Florida's water supply. Expansion of the preserve will also result in significant public benefits since the bill allows the same multiple uses of the addition which are currently permitted in the preserve, including hunting, fishing, and trapping. Large numbers of sportsmen from across the country have enjoyed these activities within the preserve for many years and will now have the benefit of an expanded area. Mineral exploration and development, which is currently permitted in the preserve, would also be allowed in the addition since only the surface rights would be acquired under the bill's provisions. I believe that all of these uses can successfully go hand in hand with recreation and preservation and strongly encourage the Federal managing agencies to permit continued multiple uses of this area. In order to allow the necessary access to the preserve addition for the public's use, the bill allows for the establishment of three access points along Interstate 75 within the boundaries of the preserve and addition.

H.R. 184 also requires the Secretary to submit to Congress within 3 years after the bill's enactment, a detailed report on the Big Cypress Preserve and Addition including management recommendations, a public use summary, the status of land acquisition, and recommendations on recreational access points. This information will enable Congress to review the management of, and activities within, the preserve in the future and make any necessary changes or improvements.

Although H.R. 184 provides for a substantial land acquisition program, negotiations are currently underway regarding a proposed exchange of a significant portion of the land within the addition for lands in Arizona. While a final agreement has not yet been reached nor approved by Congress, passage of H.R. 184, will, in no way, affect the proposed exchange.

I would like to commend the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. Lewis], for his outstanding efforts and diligence in pursuing passage of this bill. I believe he has put together an excellent piece of legislation for which I am pleased to lend my strong support. I would also like to commend Chairman UDALL for his interest in and assistance with this bill and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. VENTO, for moving this legislation forward.

H.R. 184 has received widespread praise and broad, bipartisan support as an important expansion of an area critical to the Florida Everglades, therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support and vote for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 184, the Big Cypress National Preserve addition legislation. I, too, would like to thank Chairman UDALL, also Subcommittee Chairman VENTO and the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, from California, again.

As many will recall, this important bill, which is cosponsored, as stated, by the entire Florida delegation, is identical to legislation passed in the House last year. Unfortunately the Senate bill to expand the Big Cypress was not acted upon because the 99th Congress adjourned.

□ 1600

However, later this very week our colleagues in a Senate subcommittee will consider H.R. 184's companion.

H.R. 184 once again provides the unique opportunity to acquire and protect a major land area in southwest Florida for an important addition to the Big Cypress National Preserve. It has received widespread praise and continues to enjoy broad, bipartisan support.

Of unquestioned environmental importance, this area is undoubtedly worth preserving and enhancing for its unique and wild beauty. However, this is more about protecting water—drinking water—for over more than 4 million south Florida residents. This area is part of the area, as is the existing Big Cypress Preserve, through which that water filters.

Mr. Speaker, because of continuing public benefit associated with the acquisition of this land, I urge passage of H.R. 184.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Lewis] for the work he has done. This is, indeed, a unique area. The Spartina Marsh that occurs in Florida is known

as the "River of Grass," and there is almost a continuous sheet flow of water from central Florida through the Everglades. The maintenance of that sheet flow is important so that there is not intrusion of salt water into this area, changing dramatically the environment, and consequently, the type of habitat that is necessary for maintenance of the various species is this unique type of area.

Mr. Speaker, this will be a big help, along with the good work done by the Florida water conservation districts and continues to be done. I think that Florida really leads the Nation—and it is hard for me to say this, coming from Minnesota—but they do lead the Nation in limnology, the study of fresh water, because of necessity, not necessarily for any other reason.

I am sure that, in fact, they will continue to do that. I think that the Congress, in terms of providing for this addition, is going a long way in terms of good faith, providing for preservation of what is a unique area.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to act favorably on this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 184, legislation I have cosponsored to expand the Big Cypress National Preserve.

This legislation, which has the full support of the entire Florida delegation, calls for the Federal purchase of an additional 136,000 acres surrounding the Alligator Alley-Interstate 75 conversion. Because the scheduled conversion of Alligator Alley to Interstate 75 will block access to land north and south of the alley, the Federal and State Governments are obligated to pay severance damages to the landowners. This measure will use those severance damage payments toward the purchase of the land. Of the remaining balance, 80 percent will be paid by the Federal Government and 20 percent will be paid by the State of Florida, providing a significant savings to the American taxpayers while ensuring important environmental protection for some of Florida's most beautiful and unique park land.

H.R. 184 provides an important and cost-effective opportunity for the State of Florida to acquire additional acreage for the Big Cypress National Preserve that will expand the protected natural habitat for endangered wildlife native to the area, such as orchids, bald eagles, and the Florida panther.

The additional preserve area will also enhance the ecosystem of the Everglades. Because of the unusual water flow at certain times of the year, which covers literally thousands of square miles and results in some of the most biologically diverse areas in the United States, additional land is considered necessary to address the water control problem.

Finally, H.R. 186 will enable the Federal Government to acquire this land at a significantly lower cost than otherwise might be possible. During these times of fiscal restraint, it is necessary to look for alternatives to traditional methods for land acquisition. This measure provides for critical environment

needs of both the State and Federal Government, while ensuring a cost-effective allocation of Federal resources.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Florida, Mr. LEWIS, for his leadership in sponsoring this legislation, and the entire Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for acting on this measure in such a diligent and expedient manner, and urge this House to send a strong message to the Senate by supporting H.R. 186.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to preserve valuable, environmentally sensitive wetlands in my home State of Florida, by adding 128,000 acres to the Big Cypress National Preserve.

The bill before us, H.R. 184, has many important benefits. First, public acquisition of these lands will protect the environmentally sensitive wetlands that are important to our water supply in South Florida. Alligator Alley, an existing east-west roadway running from Naples to Fort Lauderdale, FL, has caused the disruption of the natural waterflow in the Big Cypress area. The completion of Alligator Alley's conversion to Interstate 75 will improve the waterflow, and if we set aside the additional acres as part of the preserve, we will prevent any future development that might disrupt the waterflow. Also, we will allow for effective water management practices in the area.

Second, H.R. 184 will help protect the endangered Florida panther and other wildlife and waterfowl.

This bill also provides for three recreational access points along the highway that will provide boat and pedestrian access.

Finally, H.R. 184 would make the fullest possible use of funds that have already been allocated. The conversion of Alligator Alley to I-75 will restrict access to privately owned land north and south of the existing highway in the Big Cypress area, requiring the payment of severance damages to the owners of this property. Under the provisions of H.R. 184, we will use this money to pay a part of the cost of acquiring this land outright. The remainder of the purchase price will be paid jointly by the Federal Government and the State of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give their full support to this bill. I commend my colleague on the Florida delegation, Mr. LEWIS, for his outstanding work on this legislation. With this bill we will put the severance funds to better use, while protecting the water supply in one of the fastest growing areas of our Nation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 184.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1987

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 278) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide Alaska Natives with certain options for the continued ownership of lands and corporate shares received pursuant to the act, and for other purposes as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

### H.R. 278

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Amendments of 1987".*

(b) Whenever, in this Act, an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or provision of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

### CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SEC. 2. Congress finds and declares—

(a) the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) was enacted to achieve a fair and just settlement of all claims by Natives and Native groups based upon aboriginal land claims in a manner consistent with the real economic and social needs of the Alaska Natives, including maximum participation by Native people in decisions which affect their rights and property;

(b) the corporate model adopted by ANCSA is frequently ill-adapted to the reality of life in many Alaska Native villages and to traditional Native cultural values;

(c) although Congress mandated that the settlement be implemented rapidly and without litigation, the complexity of the land conveyance process and frequent and costly litigation have delayed the implementation of the settlement and significantly diminished its value;

(d) providing Alaska Natives maximum participation in decisions affecting their rights and property necessitates that ANCSA be amended to—

(A) provide the stockholders of each Native Corporation an opportunity to implement the settlement in the manner which they determine is best suited to their particular circumstances and needs, including, but not limited to, an opportunity to decide the manner in which Alaska Natives born after December 18, 1971, should participate in the settlement and whether the business corporation is the most appropriate entity to hold legal title to lands conveyed in partial settlement of aboriginal claims; and

(B) continue restrictions on the transfer of stock of Native Corporations until such time as the stockholders of a corporation may vote to terminate such restrictions; and

(e) both ANCSA, as amended, and this Act are Indian legislation enacted by Congress pursuant to its plenary authority under the Commerce Clause to regulate Indian affairs.

### NEW DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3 (43 U.S.C. 1602) is amended by adding the word "group" after the word "individual," in subsection (h); striking the word "and" at the end of subsection (k); and by striking the periods at the end of subsections (l) and (m) and inserting, in lieu thereof, semicolons.

(b) Section 3 is further amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(n) 'Native common stock' means the stock of a Native Corporation issued pursuant to subsection (g) of section 7 which carries with it the rights and restrictions provided for in paragraph (1) of subsection 7(h); and

"(o) 'descendant of a Native' means a lineal descendant of a Native or of an individual who would have been a Native if he or she were alive on December 18, 1971, or an adoptee of a Native or descendant of a Native whose adoption is recognized at law or in equity."

### NEW STOCK ISSUANCE

SEC. 4. Subsection (g) of section 7 (43 U.S.C. 1606(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g)(1) The Regional Corporation shall be authorized to issue such number of shares of Native common stock, divided into such classes of shares as may be specified in the articles of incorporation to reflect the provisions of this Act, as may be needed to issue one hundred shares of Native common stock to each Native enrolled in the region pursuant to section 5 of this Act.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other law, a Regional Corporation, if authorized by an amendment to its articles of incorporation, may issue up to one hundred shares of additional Native common stock to—

"(A) Natives born after December 18, 1971;

"(B) Natives who have attained the age of sixty-five; and

"(C) Natives who were eligible for enrollment pursuant to section 5, but who were not so enrolled;

for no consideration or for such consideration and upon such terms and conditions as may be specified in the articles of incorporation or by a resolution of the board of directors pursuant to authority expressly vested in it by the articles of incorporation.

"(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and in addition to any other existing authority, any Regional Corporation, after the date of enactment of this paragraph, may amend its articles of incorporation to authorize the issuance of additional shares of stock as provided in this paragraph.

"(B) Such shares of stock may be—

"(i) divided into classes and series within classes, with preferences, limitations, and relative rights, including, without limitation, dividend rights, voting rights, liquidation preferences, and rights to share in distributions made to stockholders under subsections (j) and (m) of this section;

"(ii) subject to alienability restrictions not in excess of the restrictions provided for in paragraph (1) of subsection (h) of this section;

"(iii) restricted in issuance to—

"(a) Natives who have reached the age of sixty-five; or

"(b) any other identifiable group of Natives, where such group is defined in terms of general applicability and, except as provided in subparagraph (H) of this paragraph, not in any way by reference to place of residence, family, or position as an officer, director, or employee of a Native Corporation, or stockholder of a Native Corporation other than the issuing Corporation; and

"(iv) issued as a dividend or other distribution upon outstanding shares of stock or for such consideration as may be permitted by law;



as may be provided in the articles of incorporation or an amendment thereto.

"(C) Any amendment to the articles of incorporation of a Regional Corporation which permits the issuance of classes or series of stock other than Native common stock shall specify the maximum number of shares of any such class or series and the maximum number of votes that may be held by shares of such class or series.

"(D) During any period in which the restrictions on alienation of Native common stock imposed by paragraph (1) of section 7(h) are in effect, no stock may be issued under this paragraph to a group of individuals composed only of employees, officers or directors of the Regional Corporation.

"(E) If any amendment to the articles of incorporation permits the issuance of classes or series of stock which, when issued, singly or in combination, may cause the outstanding shares of Native common stock to represent less than a majority of the voting power of all stock in the Regional Corporation, the stockholders of such corporation shall be expressly so advised in the proxy statement or other informational material distributed in advance of their vote upon the amendment.

"(F) In no event may shares of stock other than Native common stock be issued more than thirteen months after the date of the stockholder vote authorizing the issuance of such stock if, as a result of the issuance of such stock, the outstanding shares of Native common stock will represent less than a majority of the voting power of all stock in the Regional Corporation. The restriction of this subparagraph shall be of no further force and effect if shares of stock previously have been lawfully issued pursuant to this paragraph which have caused the shares of the Native common stock to represent less than a majority of the voting power of all stock in the Regional Corporation or if the restrictions upon alienation of Native common stock provided for in paragraph (1) of section 7(h) have expired under section 7a or have been terminated under section 7(h) by vote of the stockholders.

"(G) Notwithstanding the issuance of additional shares of Native common stock or new classes or series of stock pursuant to this paragraph, the Regional Corporation shall continue to apply the ratio last computed under subsection (m) of this section before the date of enactment of this paragraph for purposes of distributing funds under subsections (j) and (m) of this section.

"(H) If shares of different classes or series have been issued pursuant to this paragraph to nonvillage stockholders as described in subsection (m), distributions payable under subsections (j) and (m) of this section shall be made with respect to such classes or series in accordance with the rights, if any, of each class or series to share in such distributions as provided in the articles of incorporation or an amendment thereto and, if so provided, the right to share in such distributions may be established as a right or other security separate from any other shares issued to such nonvillage stockholders.

"(I) Common stock issued pursuant to this subsection which carries the same rights and restrictions provided for in section 7(h) or which is issued in substitution for Native common stock shall be deemed to be Native common stock as long as all such rights and restrictions are in effect with respect thereto.

"(4) The issuance of additional shares of Native common stock or other stock pursuant to paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsec-

tion shall have no effect on the division and distribution of revenues pursuant to subsection (i) of this section."

#### NATIVE COMMON STOCK: RIGHTS; ALIENATION RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 5. Subsection (h) of section 7 (43 U.S.C. 1606(h)) is amended to read as follows:

"(h)(1)(A) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph and in paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, Native common stock of a Regional Corporation issued pursuant to subsection (g) of this section shall—

"(i) carry a right to vote in elections for the board of directors and on such other questions as properly may be presented to stockholders;

"(ii) permit the holder to receive dividends or other distributions from the Regional Corporation; and

"(iii) vest in the holder all rights of a stockholder in a business corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alaska.

"(B) Until the termination of such restrictions by the stockholders under paragraph (2) of this subsection or pursuant to section 7a, Native common stock, inchoate rights thereto, and any dividends paid or distributions made with respect thereto, may not be—

"(i) sold;

"(ii) pledged;

"(iii) subject to a lien or judgment execution;

"(iv) assigned in present or future;

"(v) treated as an asset in a bankruptcy estate; or

"(vi) otherwise alienated.

"(C) The limitation contained in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph shall not apply to transfers of Native common stock if such transfers are made to Natives or descendants of Natives pursuant to a court decree of separation, divorce or child support or by a stockholder who is a member of a professional organization, association, or board which limits the ability of that stockholder to practice his or her profession because of holding stock issued under this section.

"(D) Except as provided in section 7a, the restrictions on alienation of Native common stock provided in this paragraph shall remain in effect until such time as the stockholders of a Regional Corporation vote to terminate such restrictions as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (F) of this paragraph, a Regional Corporation may terminate the restrictions on alienation imposed on its Native common stock by paragraph (1) of this subsection as provided in this paragraph.

"(B) At any time after the date of enactment of this paragraph, a resolution to terminate such restrictions may be adopted by the board of directors on its own motion or pursuant to a stockholders' petition as provided in paragraph (6)(D) of this subsection. A resolution of the board of directors of a Regional Corporation to terminate such restrictions shall be submitted to a vote of the stockholders in accordance with the procedures set forth in paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(C) A resolution to terminate restrictions adopted pursuant to this paragraph shall make provision for the time of termination, either by the establishment of the date certain or the description of a specific event upon which the restrictions shall terminate.

"(D) The approval of a resolution under this paragraph shall be considered to be an amendment to the articles of incorporation of the Regional Corporation for the pur-

poses of paragraph (6) of this subsection. On the date of termination as established in such resolution, all Native common stock previously issued shall be deemed canceled and shares of stock of the appropriate class shall be issued to each holder of Native common stock, share for share, subject only to such restrictions as may be provided in an amendment to the articles of incorporation adopted pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection or in agreements between the corporation and the individual stockholders.

"(E) The rejection of a resolution adopted pursuant to this paragraph by the stockholders of a Regional Corporation shall not preclude votes on subsequent resolutions adopted and submitted to a vote pursuant to this paragraph.

"(F) Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, if the board of directors of the Bristol Bay Native Corporation or any Village Corporation in the Bristol Bay region adopts, within one year of the date of enactment of this paragraph, a resolution electing to follow the procedures set forth in section 7a of this Act, the provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to such corporation.

"(3)(A) Upon the death of any holder of Native common stock, ownership of such stock shall be transferred in accordance with the last will and testament of such holder or under applicable laws of intestate succession, except that, in the event the deceased stockholder fails to dispose of all of his or her Native common stock by will and if such stockholder has no heirs under applicable laws of intestacy who are Natives or descendants of Natives, such Native common stock shall escheat to the appropriate Regional Corporation.

"(B) In the event that stock would be transferred by devise or inheritance to a person not a Native or a descendant of a Native, the Regional Corporation shall have the right to purchase such stock for its fair market value.

"(4)(A) Notwithstanding the restrictions on alienation imposed by paragraph (1) of this subsection, any Regional Corporation is hereby authorized to amend its articles of incorporation to permit it to purchase and, for that purpose, its stockholders to sell, any or all of its Native common stock then issued and outstanding.

"(B) Payment for such stock shall be made out of—

"(i) unreserved or unrestricted earned surplus of the corporation; or

"(ii) net profits for the fiscal year in which the purchase is being made and for the preceding fiscal year, except when the corporation is unable to pay its debts as they become due in the usual course of business.

"(C) For the purpose of this paragraph, net profits derived from the exploitation or liquidation of timber resources or subsurface estate may be determined without consideration of depletion of those assets resulting from lapse of time, consumption, liquidation, or exploitation.

"(D) Shares of stock purchased pursuant to this paragraph shall become nonvoting treasury stock or may be canceled by the Regional Corporation in accordance with law.

"(E) In the case of each purchase of Native common stock pursuant to this paragraph, the board of directors shall determine a price at which such purchase will be made. Such price, if determined in good faith, shall conclusively be presumed to be

fair. In determining such price, the board of directors, at its option, may exclude from such determination the value of the land or any interest therein received by the Regional Corporation pursuant to this Act which is committed by the corporation to Native traditional or cultural uses or is of speculative or unknown value on the date such determination is made.

"(F) With respect to any purchase under this paragraph, all holders of such Regional Corporation's Native common stock shall be given a fair opportunity to participate in any offer by the corporation to purchase shares of its Native common stock on the same basis as is made available to any holder of such stock.

"(5) Native common stock transferred through inheritance to a person who is not a Native shall not carry voting rights. The lapse of the right to vote in a holder of Native common stock upon a transfer by inheritance or otherwise may be restored by the adoption of an amendment to the articles of incorporation, but only if such shares of stock are held by a Native or a descendant of a Native.

"(6)(A) Notwithstanding any provision of Alaska law, other than those which relate to proxy statements or solicitations which are not inconsistent with this paragraph, and except as provided in section 7a of this Act—

"(i) any amendment to the articles of incorporation of a Regional Corporation authorized by this subsection or subsection (g) of this section;

"(ii) a transfer of assets made pursuant to section 7b;

"(iii) a resolution described in paragraph 2(C) of this subsection; or

"(iv) a resolution described in paragraph (B) of this paragraph;

shall be approved as provided in this paragraph.

"(B) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the proposal and directing that it be submitted to a vote at the annual, or a special, meeting of the stockholders. One or more such amendments or resolutions may be submitted to the stockholders and voted upon at one meeting.

"(C) A written or printed notice, setting forth the proposal or summary of the changes to be effected, or the proxy statement and related proxy material if required under applicable law, shall be delivered by hand or sent by first class mail to each stockholder of record entitled to vote not less than fifty nor more than sixty days before the date of the meeting at the address of such stockholder as it appears on the records of the corporation.

"(D) With respect to any amendment or resolution described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, if the holders of at least 15 per centum or, in the case of an amendment to terminate restrictions on the alienability of Native common stock, one-third of the outstanding shares of Native common stock entitled to be voted petition the board of directors to adopt and submit such amendment or resolution to the vote of the stockholders, the board of directors shall adopt a resolution to that effect and submit it to the stockholders as provided in this paragraph. The procedural and disclosure requirements pertaining to the solicitation of proxies under State law shall govern solicitation of signatures on any such petition. If the petition meets the aforementioned standards and if—

"(i) the board of directors agrees with such petition, it shall submit the resolution

and either the proponent's statement or its own statement in support of the resolution to the stockholders for a vote; or

"(ii) the board of directors disagrees with the petition for any reason, it shall submit the resolution and the proponent's statement to the stockholders and may, at its discretion, submit an opposing statement and/or an alternative resolution.

"(E)(i) An amendment to the articles of incorporation that would have the effect of removing the restrictions on alienation of Native common stock provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be approved if such amendment receives the affirmative vote of at least a majority of the outstanding shares of Native common stock entitled to vote on such amendment.

"(ii) Any other amendment or resolution described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall be approved—

"(a) if voted upon by at least 51 per centum of the votes represented by the capital stock of the Regional Corporation entitled to be voted on such amendment or resolution; and

"(b) if such amendment or resolution receives the affirmative vote of at least a majority of all votes cast,

subject to the right of the board of directors of the Regional Corporation to provide a quorum or vote requirement greater than subclause (a) or (b) of this clause, or both, and to the right of the Regional Corporation in its articles of incorporation to provide a vote by classes of stock for all or any of such actions.

"(F) If the result of a stockholder vote under this paragraph is the continuation of the restrictions against alienation of Native common stock, a stockholder who voted in favor of termination of the restriction may demand and receive payment from the corporation for all of his or her shares, but only if, contemporaneously with such vote, the stockholders approve a resolution providing for such right. The procedure established by Alaska law for the exercise of the right of a dissenting stockholder shall be followed, if such right is made available pursuant to this subparagraph.

"(G) A resolution adopted pursuant to subparagraph (F) of this paragraph may provide that Native common stock shall be valued on the basis set forth in section 7a(f)(2) and that the form of payment to dissenting stockholders shall be as provided in section 7a(f)(3).

"(7) Notwithstanding a stockholder vote to terminate restrictions on alienation of Native common stock under paragraph (2) of this subsection or the expiration of such restrictions pursuant to section 7a, a Regional Corporation, prior to the effective date of such termination, may amend its articles of incorporation to impose any restrictions upon the replacement common stock issued pursuant to paragraph 2(D) of this subsection permitted under applicable law as well as restrictions providing for—

"(A) the denial of voting rights to any holder of such replacement common stock who is not a Native or descendant of a Native; and

"(B) the granting to the corporation, or to the corporation and the stockholder's immediate family, on reasonable terms, the first right to purchase a stockholder's replacement common stock prior to the sale or transfer of such stock, other than a transfer by inheritance, to any other party, including a transfer in satisfaction of a lien, writ of attachment, judgment execution, pledge, or other encumbrance."

#### BRISTOL BAY REGION: SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"Sec. 7a. (a) If the Bristol Bay Native Corporation or any Village Corporation located in the Bristol Bay region adopts a resolution as provided in paragraph (2)(F) of subsection 7(h), such corporation may extend the restrictions on alienation of Native common stock as provided in this section.

"(b)(1) Within two years after the election under paragraph (2)(F) of section 7(h) and, if the quorum requirement specified in subsection (e) of this section is not satisfied, annually thereafter, the board of directors of such corporation shall adopt, and submit to a vote of its stockholders, a resolution to amend its articles of incorporation to extend the restrictions on alienation of its Native common stock.

"(2) Such resolution shall provide for an extension of the restrictions for a period of not less than twenty nor more than fifty years.

"(3) If a resolution under paragraph (1) of this subsection is adopted, such corporation may, prior to the expiration of the period of extension or any successor extension period, further extend the restrictions under the provisions of this section.

"(c)(1) If any vote conducted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section is ineffective because of a continuing or repeated lack of quorum as provided in subsection (e) of this section or if the holders of Native common stock defeat a resolution to continue restrictions on alienation, the board of directors shall adopt, and submit to the vote of the stockholders, a resolution which establishes the date or describes the specific event upon which the restrictions shall terminate.

"(2) If no such resolution is voted upon and approved, the restrictions shall terminate one year from either the date of the vote disapproving the resolution to extend such restrictions or the last date on which a lack of a quorum existed, as the case may be, or on December 18, 1991, whichever date later occurs.

"(3) On the date of termination of such restrictions, all Native common stock of such corporation previously issued shall be deemed canceled and shares of stock of the appropriate class shall be issued to each stockholder, share for share, subject only to such restrictions as may be provided by the articles of incorporation, including any amendment thereto adopted pursuant to section 7(h)(7), or in agreements between the corporation and individual stockholders.

"(d)(1) Notwithstanding any provision of Alaska law, except those relating to stockholders' rights of petition and to proxy statements and solicitations which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this section—

"(A) any amendment to the articles of incorporation of a corporation authorized by this section or subsections 7(g) and 7(h) (4), (5), and (7) of this Act;

"(B) a transfer of assets made pursuant to section 7b;

"(C) a resolution described in subsection (c) of this section; or

"(D) a resolution described in subsection (f)(2) of this section;

shall be approved as provided in this subsection.

"(2) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the proposal and directing that it be submitted to a vote at the annual, or a special, meeting of the stock-



holders. One or more such amendments or resolutions may be submitted to the stockholders and voted upon at one meeting.

"(3) A written or printed notice setting forth the proposal or a summary of the changes to be effected shall be given to each stockholder of record entitled to vote not less than fifty nor more than sixty days before the date of the meeting, either personally or by mail.

"(e)(1) In order for a resolution to be approved under this section, the proposal must be voted upon by at least 51 per centum of the outstanding shares of Native common stock entitled to be voted and must receive the affirmative vote of at least 50 per centum plus one of the shares voted.

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, the stockholders may require a minimum vote of more than 51 per centum of the outstanding shares of Native common stock entitled to be voted or an affirmative vote greater than 50 per centum of the shares voted, or both, to approve any such proposal.

"(f)(1) If the result of a stockholder vote under this section is the extension of restrictions against alienation or a transfer of assets pursuant to section 7b, a stockholder who voted against the extension or transfer may demand and receive from the corporation the fair market value of his or her shares. Unless longer periods of time are authorized in the bylaws of the corporation, the procedure established by Alaska law for the exercise of the right of a dissenting stockholder to demand and receive payment for his or her shares in certain cases shall be followed to the extent such right is made available pursuant to this subsection.

"(2) The stockholders of the corporation may adopt a resolution, concurrent with the vote authorized under subsection (a) of this section, which provides that, in the event dissenters' rights are exercised—

"(A) the Native common stock shall be valued as restricted stock, having the same restrictions for the same period made applicable to the stock by the vote; and/or

"(B) the value of the land or any interest therein received by the corporation pursuant to this Act which—

"(i) is committed by the corporation to Native traditional or cultural uses; and/or

"(ii) is of speculative or unknown value on the date such resolution is adopted;

shall be excluded by the stockholder, the corporation and any court in the determination of the fair market value of the shares of Native common stock to be purchased from such stockholder by the corporation; and/or

"(C) payments to each dissenting stockholder shall be made by the corporation through the issuance to such stockholder of a nonnegotiable note in the principal amount of the payment due, which note shall be secured either by—

"(i) a payment bond issued by an insurance company or financial institution;

"(ii) the deposit in escrow of securities or property having a fair market value equal to at least 125 per centum of the face amount of the note; or

"(iii) a lien upon the real property interests of the corporation valued at 125 per centum or more of the face amount of the note, other than lands or interests therein which are committed to Native traditional or cultural uses and the percentage interest in its timber resources and subsurface estate that would result in the recognition of 'Gross Section 7(i) Revenues' within the meaning of, and pursuant to, article II, sec-

tion 1(d) of the 7(i) agreement cited in subsection (f)(2) of section 7b of this Act.

"(3) Any note issued pursuant to this subsection shall provide that—

"(A) interest shall be paid semi-annually, beginning as of the date the corporation elected to extend stock restrictions on Native common stock or transfer assets pursuant to section 7b of this Act, at the rate applicable on such date to obligations of the United States having a maturity date of one year; and

"(B) the principal amount and any undistributed interest shall be payable to the former stockholder or his or her heirs or devisees—

"(i) at any time, at the option of the corporation; or

"(ii) if not so called, on December 18, 1991, or, if the restrictions on Native common stock otherwise would have expired on a later date, on such date or five years after the date of election, whichever comes first, or, if the transfer of assets occurs after December 18, 1991, then five years after the date of such transfer."

#### TRANSFER OF ASSETS: QUALIFIED TRANSFeree ENTITY

Sec. 7. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is further amended by adding the following new section:

"Sec. 7b. (a) Any Native Corporation or the stockholders of a Native Corporation which has been dissolved involuntarily under applicable law is hereby authorized to convey any or all of its assets, including the title to the surface or subsurface of land, to a qualified transferee entity as provided in this section. In cases where a Native Corporation has been involuntarily dissolved under State law, a State court of appropriate jurisdiction, upon petition of no less than twenty-five of the former stockholders of such corporation, may order the transfer of real property assets and such other assets remaining after satisfaction of outstanding debts upon an affirmative vote of individuals who were shareholders in the dissolved corporation on a resolution as provided in section 7(h)(6) or 7(c) without requiring that the resolution be adopted by the Board of Directors.

"(b) The conveyance of such assets shall be as provided in a resolution, including a provision for the payment of consideration or no consideration as desired, adopted by the board of directors of such corporation and submitted to a vote of its shareholders as provided in section 7(h)(6) or section 7a of this Act, as the case may be.

"(c) An entity shall be qualified to accept a transfer of assets conveyed pursuant to this section if it—

"(1) is organized pursuant to, or recognized by, State or Federal law;

"(2) has a membership composed of persons whose interest in the entity is non-transferable;

"(3) provides membership for every person who holds Native common stock in the corporation making the transfer of assets on the day before the date of such transfer; and

"(4) except as provided in paragraph (3), accepts as new members only Natives or descendants of Natives.

"(d) Notwithstanding any provision of State or Federal law, a qualified transferee entity is authorized to—

"(1) by a vote of its members;

"(A) limit its membership to Natives or descendants of Natives; and

"(B) admit to membership non-Natives only for the purpose of complying with

paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of this section;

"(2) distribute cash and other assets to its members, except that such entity shall not convey fee title to land or interests therein unless authorized or required by section 14(c) or 21(j) of this Act; and

"(3) exchange lands or interests therein pursuant to the provisions of section 22(f) of this Act and section 1302(h) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

"(e) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 21 of this Act shall continue to apply to any lands or interests therein conveyed by a Native Corporation to a qualified transferee entity pursuant to this section.

"(f)(1) Any revenues subject to distribution under section 7(i) of this Act derived from assets conveyed pursuant to this section shall remain subject to 7(i) to the same extent such revenues would have been subject if the conveyance had not occurred.

"(2) A Regional Corporation shall not convey assets subject to section 7(i) to more than one qualified transferee entity. Prior to receiving a conveyance of an asset subject to section 7(i), a qualified transferee entity shall agree in writing—

"(A) to be bound by the provisions of the agreement dated June 29, 1982, among and between the parties to Aleut Corporation et al. against Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (Civ. Act. A75-53 D. Ak.); and

"(B) to waive its sovereign immunity, if any, with respect to claims arising under section 7(i) or this section.

"(3) The Regional Corporation or, in the case of its dissolution, another single entity designated by its stockholders or the United States district court, as appropriate, shall be responsible for administering the provisions of section 7(i) and the June 29, 1982, agreement with respect to assets subject to section 7(i) conveyed by such corporation pursuant to this section.

"(4) After the conveyance of an asset subject to section 7(i) by a Regional Corporation, such asset shall be security for the payment of such corporation or its successor entity of all revenues which the corporation is obligated to distribute to other Regional Corporations pursuant to section 7(i).

"(g)(1) If a resolution conveying assets is approved by a stockholder vote pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any stockholder who voted against the resolution may demand and receive payment from the corporation for all of his or her shares, but only if, concurrent with such vote, the stockholders of the Native Corporation adopt a resolution expressly providing for such right.

"(2) The procedure established by Alaska law for the exercise of the right of a dissenting stockholder to demand and receive payment for his or her shares in certain cases shall be followed if such right is made available pursuant to this subsection.

"(3) For the purpose of this section, a resolution establishing dissenters' rights may provide that the Native common stock shall be valued on the basis set forth in section 7a(f)(2) and that the form of payment to dissenting stockholders shall be as provided in section 7a(f)(3)."

#### DISCLAIMER: TRIBAL GOVERNMENT

Sec. 8. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"Sec. 7c. No provision of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Amendments of 1986 shall be construed as enlarging or diminishing or in any way affecting the scope

of governmental powers, if any, of an Alaska Native village entity, including entities organized under the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 987), as amended, or Traditional Councils."

Sec. 9. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is further amended by adding a new section as follows:

"Sec. 7d. The Aleut Corporation, Cook Inlet Region, Inc., and Koniag, Inc., and any Village Corporation within the Aleut and Cook Inlet regions may, by a vote of its board of directors within one year after the effective date of this section, elect to comply with the provision of section 7a with respect to a stockholder vote on the question of whether to continue restrictions on alienation of Native common stock imposed by paragraph (1) of section 7(h) beyond December 18, 1991."

#### VILLAGE AND URBAN CORPORATIONS: NATIVE GROUPS

Sec. 10. Subsection (c) of section 8 (43 U.S.C. 1607(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The provisions of subsections (g), (h), and (o) of section 7 and of section 7a of this Act relating to Regional Corporations shall apply in all respects to Village Corporations, Urban Corporations and Native groups, except that—

"(A) audits need not be transmitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives or to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

"(B) subject to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection and section 7a, restrictions on the alienation of Native common stock of such corporations, inchoate rights thereto, and any dividends paid or distributions made with respect thereto shall continue after December 18, 1991."

"(2) The restrictions on alienation of Native common stock of Village Corporations, Urban Corporations and incorporated Native groups may be terminated or extended by the adoption of an amendment to their articles of incorporation to such effect pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (6) of subsection 7(h) or of section 7a, as the case may be, except that—

"(A) with respect to action under section 7(h), only one such vote may be held prior to December 18, 1991 and only once annually thereafter; and

"(B) with respect to action under section 7a, votes shall be held as provided in subsection (b)(1) of section 7a."

#### CONSTITUTIONALITY: UNITED STATES JURISDICTION

Sec. 11. Section 10 (43 U.S.C. 1609) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The United States District Court for the District of Alaska is vested with exclusive original jurisdiction over any action challenging the constitutionality of any provision of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Amendments of 1986. Such action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges as provided in section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, with a direct appeal from any final judgment to the United States Supreme Court.

"(2) It being the express intention and direction of Congress that in no circumstances shall enactment of this Act result in any liability to the United States, the court shall not enter a money judgment against the United States in fashioning appropriate relief upon a determination that any of such sections violates the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution."

#### SUBSURFACE CONVEYANCE TO VILLAGE ENTITY

Sec. 12. Section 14 (43 U.S.C. 1613) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(1)(1) A Regional Corporation may convey any subsurface estate owned by such corporation to a village entity which acquired or currently owns the surface estate pursuant to this Act.

"(2) Notwithstanding any conveyance pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Regional Corporation shall continue to receive the thirty percent of the revenues from any development of the subsurface estate it would have retained had there been no such conveyance and the remaining seventy percent of such revenues shall be distributed in accordance with section 7(i).

"(3) Any conveyance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 7b as if the village entity were a qualified transferee entity. The document or documents effecting such conveyance shall be recorded by the Regional Corporation, together with copies of section 7b and this subsection, in the land records of the appropriate recording district.

"(4) The village entity to which any subsurface estate is conveyed pursuant to this subsection may not convey or otherwise transfer all or any part of such subsurface estate to any other entity without the express consent to the transfer Regional Corporation."

#### REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS: IMMUNITIES

Sec. 13. Paragraph (1) of subsection 21(d) (43 U.S.C. 1620(d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) All land and interests therein conveyed pursuant to this Act, to any Native individual, Native group, Village or Regional Corporation, or a corporation established pursuant to section 14(h)(3) of this Act shall be, so long as such land and interests therein are not developed or leased to third parties or are used solely for purposes of exploration, entitled from the date of their conveyance to immunity from—

"(i) adverse possession and similar claims based upon legal theories of estoppel;

"(ii) real property taxes by any governmental entity;

"(iii) judgment resulting from any claim based upon or arising under title 11 of the United States Code relating to bankruptcy (or any successor statute), other insolvency or moratorium laws, or other laws affecting creditors' rights generally;

"(iv) unless such immunity is waived by the corporation in a valid and binding contract executed prior to the commencement of such proceedings, judgment in any action at law or equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by any Native Corporation or Native group or any officer, director, or stockholder of any such corporation or group; and

"(v) involuntary distribution or conveyance related to the involuntary dissolution of the Native Corporation.

"(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, lands shall not be considered to be developed solely as a result of construction, installation, or placement upon such land of any structure, fixture, device, or other improvement intended to enable, assist, or otherwise further the subsistence or other customary or traditional uses of such land.

"(C) Immunities provided for in this paragraph shall be in addition to those immunities or other benefits to which such lands or interests therein may be entitled under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, but shall not apply to any judg-

ment in any action at law or equity or to any arbitration award arising out of any claim regarding revenue sharing under section 7(i) of this Act.

"(D) Land to which this paragraph applies and lands conveyed pursuant to section 7b of this Act shall be subject to condemnation for public purposes in accordance with the provisions of applicable State law.

"(E) Except as provided in section 14(c)(3), no trustee, receiver or custodian vested under applicable Federal or State law with any right, title or interest of any Native Corporation or Native group may assign or lease to a third party any land subject to this paragraph which has not theretofore been developed or leased, or commence development or use of the land other than for purposes of exploration, and such trustee, receiver, or custodian may not convey any right, title, or interest in land and interests therein protected under this paragraph to any third party, except pursuant to a judgment or arbitral award regarding revenue sharing under section 7(i)."

#### CONFORMING AMENDMENT: SECTION 21

Sec. 14. Subsection (f) of section 21 (43 U.S.C. 1620(f)) is amended by striking the phrase "Until January 1, 1992" and inserting, in lieu thereof, the phrase "Until such time as the limitations upon alienation of Native common stock have been removed pursuant to section 7(h)(2) or have expired pursuant to section 7a of this Act".

#### SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

Sec. 15. Section 27 (85 Stat. 688) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 27. The provisions of this Act, as amended, are severable and, if any provision of the Act is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any other provision."

#### CORPORATIONS EXEMPT FROM SECURITIES LAWS

Sec. 16. Section 28 (43 U.S.C. 1625) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 28. (a)(1) Any corporation organized pursuant to this Act shall be exempt from the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 789), the Securities Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 74), and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 881), as amended, through the earlier of the date after—

"(A) the date on which the corporation issues any shares of stock which will not be issued solely to Natives or descendants of Natives or to entities established for the sole benefit of Natives or descendants of Natives; or

"(B) the date on which the corporation removes the limitations on alienation of Native common stock as provided for in section 7(h)(2) or the date on which such restrictions terminate under section 7a of this Act.

"(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that any such corporation shall or shall not, after such date, be subject to the provisions of such Acts.

"(b)(1) Any such corporation which, but for this section, would be subject to the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall transmit to its stockholders each year a report containing substantially all the information required to be included in an annual report to stockholders by a corporation which is subject to the provisions of such Act.

"(2) For the purposes of determining the applicability of the registration requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 after the date determined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, holders of



Native common stock shall be excluded from the calculation of the number of shareholders of record pursuant to section 12(g) of that Act.

"(c) The provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940 shall not, in any event, apply to any corporation organized pursuant to this Act prior to January 1, 2001."

#### FEDERAL PROGRAMS: MINORITY CORPORATION

SEC. 17. Section 29 (43 U.S.C. 1626) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) In determining the eligibility of any household or individual Native or descendant of a Native to participate in the Food Stamp program, receive assistance under the Social Security Act of financial assistance or benefits available under any other Federal or federally assisted program otherwise available to the Native people of Alaska as citizens of the United States and of the State of Alaska, any compensation, remuneration, revenue, stock, land, or other benefits received by any individual, any household or any member of such household under this Act, including land received from such individual's Native Corporation or Native group organized under this Act, shall be disregarded and shall not be considered as a resource or otherwise utilized as a basis for making such determination.

"(d) Until such time as less than 50 per centum of the voting power of a Native Corporation is represented by shares of outstanding Native common stock or any other securities of such corporation held by Natives or descendants of Natives entitled to vote, such Native Corporation for all purposes of Federal law shall be considered a corporation owned and controlled by Alaska Natives."

#### CONFORMING AMENDMENT: SECTION 30

SEC. 18. Subsection (b) of section 30 (43 U.S.C. 1627(b)) is amended by striking the phrase "prior to December 19, 1991" and inserting, in lieu thereof, the phrase "while the Native common stock of all corporations subject to merger or consolidation remain subject to restraints on alienation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 278 makes some extremely important amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlements Act.

Congressman LUJAN and I are the only remaining members of the Interior Committee who were on the com-

mittee when we passed this historic legislation in 1971.

I remember the sense of satisfaction and the great hopes and expectations we had for the success and future of the Alaska Natives under ANCSA. The act represented an innovative, experimental approach by Congress to the settlement of Indian claims and the treatment of Indian tribes.

Over 15 years have passed since enactment of ANCSA and it is clear that it has not fully met our hopes and expectations. It is apparent that it did not wholly satisfy the real economic, social and cultural needs of Native people and almost all who are affected by the act agree that major modifications are in order. H.R. 278 provides those changes.

In settling the Native land claims, ANCSA extinguished Native aboriginal rights and, in return, provided for the conveyance of 44,000,000 acres of land and nearly \$1 billion to the Natives.

To provide a framework for the administration of the settlement, the act required Alaska Natives to create a series of regional and village corporations. Alaska Natives of at least one-quarter Native blood who were alive on December 18, 1971, were enrolled in these regions and villages and issued shares of stock in those corporations.

H.R. 278 makes three basic changes in ANCSA in order to protect lands and Native interests.

Under ANCSA, stock owned by a Native cannot be sold or otherwise alienated until December 18, 1991. After that date, the stock will be freely alienable with the distinct possibility that Natives will lose control of their corporations and lands. H.R. 278 amends ANCSA to indefinitely extend the period of inalienability unless the shareholders of a corporation vote to terminate it.

Second, the bill amends ANCSA to permit corporations to issue new stock to Natives who were born after the 1971 date of enactment. Under existing law, young Natives are precluded from sharing in the benefits of the settlement and in their own heritage.

Finally, the bill amends ANCSA to facilitate the transfer of lands from the Native corporations to other entities, including Native tribal entities, which might better protect their lands for the long term.

Mr. Speaker, this vital legislation has, unfortunately, become embroiled in the issue of the continued existence of Native tribal entities in Alaska. As one of the two remaining members of the 1971 Interior Committee, let me make my position clear on that point.

ANCSA was an Indian Land Claims Settlement Act. As noted in the committee report on this bill, Congress did not intend to deal in any way with the issue of tribal entities. That was an issue which was left to other applica-

ble law. The same is true of the amendments made to ANCSA by H.R. 278.

Neither ANCSA nor these amendments are intended to affect the legal status or tribal entities in Alaska.

If they exist under other applicable law, ANCSA and these amendments are not intended to impair that existence. If they do not so exist, ANCSA and these amendments are not intended to revitalize them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote for passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of H.R. 278, I rise in support of the legislation. Also, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for his assistance and leadership in helping to bring the legislation before this Chamber.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I intend to briefly describe the background of this legislation and its major provisions. This bill is identical to legislation which passed this body last July.

Sixteen years have now passed since the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 was signed into law by President Nixon. The Settlement Act of 1971 was a bold, far-reaching land claims settlement act. It represented an important change in traditional Federal Indian law, since Congress chose to have the act administered by Native corporations organized under State law, instead of creating reservations found in other States. Under the law, the land would be transferred to these corporations, which would be given 20 years of protection from sale and certain property taxes. This 20 year period was intended to provide the corporations with time to develop economically without the pressure of corporate takeovers.

The intent of the Settlement Act was stated in section 2(b) of ANCSA, which is not changed under this legislation. Section 2(b) states in part:

The settlement should be accomplished rapidly, with certainty . . . without litigation . . .

The protections of ANCSA were for 20 years, but the law also called for expeditious conveyances, "Without extensive litigation." Sixteen years after ANCSA, lands remain to be conveyed and litigation still hampers some selections and conveyances.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that the land title claims were settled immediately and completely and were not limited to 20 years.

As the 20 year deadline draws near, there has been a great deal of concern in Alaska Native communities that the

unrestricted sale of stock could result in the loss of lands conveyed under the Settlement Act. As the committee report notes, the possible loss of land from Native ownership is of paramount concern. It is the reason for this legislation.

To address this concern, the legislation would provide for the continuation of restrictions contained in ANCSA, unless an individual Native corporation takes certain actions to eliminate or modify the sale restrictions. Dissenter's rights are provided where the corporation elects to continue stock restrictions. In addition to clarification or corporate share ownership rights, the bill provides for land ownership protections in the form of statutory protections similar to those now in Alaska Land Bank Program.

Finally, as I have stated throughout consideration of this bill, this legislation does not deal with governments. It deals solely with stock and land ownership. These are ownership issues of private individuals and corporations—not governments.

The bill does not affect Government powers, it does not grant new lands or funds, and does not have any significant fiscal impact on the Federal Government.

Many individuals and groups in Alaska have spent a great deal of time and effort over the past 2 years in considering responses to the 1991 deadline. Through a series of village meetings, and special conventions, Alaska Natives have deliberated, and made many difficult decisions which resulted in proposals to Congress. From there, this legislation was considered, changed in some respects, and then was the subject of congressional hearings in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Washington, DC over the last 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are intended to respond to a real concern in rural Alaska and to maintain the intent of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. Nothing more, nothing less. It is my belief that we must act to provide flexibility for the villages in rural Alaska if the intent that brought us the settlement in 1971 is to be maintained.

We have the opportunity to make the Settlement Act work better to meet the needs of Alaska, especially rural villages.

Finally, I will restate my conviction that removal of the 1991 deadlines in ANCSA is of great importance to future generations of Alaskans. To the extent that groups and individuals seek to manipulate legal definitions to achieve control over the use of lands owned by Native Alaskans through opposition to 1991 remedial legislation, they jeopardize a way of life in rural Alaska which is a fundamental strength in the State.

Alaskans in rural communities who have thrived quietly and privately

through good and bad economic times will not suffer, yet their children and grandchildren will if land ownership is not protected for future generations.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise in support of this measure, which provides for the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act.

At the direction of the chairman in 1985, we held hearings at Anchorage with the ranking member, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Young], on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I concur that the optimism with regard to which the Natives would be able to adapt to a sort of Wall Street environment by 1991 was in error. The fact is, I think, that we need to continue some of the special protections, some of the special technical assistance that has been available into the future, as well as solve the issue with regard to extension of the rights to those that did not have ownership at the time that the cutoff dates occurred in the initial ANCSA legislation.

□ 1610

So I am pleased to rise in support of the bill. I know this is an important measure for the State of Alaska. I am pleased to rise in support of our colleague, the gentleman from Alaska, with regard to the spirit of this legislation and the extension of this 1991 date.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 278, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DESIGNATING A SEGMENT OF THE MERCED RIVER, CA, AS A COMPONENT OF THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 317) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating a segment of the Merced River in California as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF MERCED RIVER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"(62) MERCED, CALIFORNIA.—The South Fork Merced River from its source (including Red Peak Fork, Merced Peak Fork, Triple Peak Fork, and Lyle Fork) in Yosemite National Park to the junction with the main stem, and the main stem from its source in Yosemite National Park to a point at Highway 140 at the town of Briceburg, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Proposed Merced River', to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture; except that those portions of the river within the boundaries of Yosemite National Park, the El Portal Administrative unit, and the portion of the river flowing through lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior. With respect to the portions of the river designated by this paragraph which are within the boundaries of Yosemite National Park, and the El Portal Administrative unit, the requirements of subsection (b) of this section shall be fulfilled by the Secretary of the Interior through appropriate revisions to the general management plan for the park, and the boundaries, classification, and development plans for such portions need not be published in the Federal Register. Such revisions to the general management plan for the park shall assure that no development or use of park lands shall be undertaken that is inconsistent with the designation of such river segments. For the purposes of the segment designated by this paragraph, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and for development."

(b) RENUMBERING.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by redesignating the paragraphs relating to the Cache La Poudre River, the Saline Bayou, Black Creek, the Klickitat, and the White Salmon as paragraphs (57) through (61), respectively.

#### SEC. 2. LOWER MAIN STEM OF MERCED RIVER.

For the purpose of protecting the scenic, natural, cultural, recreational, and fish and wildlife values of the lower main stem of the Merced River, California, from Highway 140 at the town of Briceburg to the point of maximum flood control storage of Lake McClure, such segment shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in the same manner as the other river segments referred to in such subsection (a). The protection afforded by this section shall expire on September 30, 1992.

#### SEC. 3. CONSULTATION.

For purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with the appropriate State and local officials, including the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors, as required by the provisions of section 3(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Califor-



nia [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 317 would designate the main stem of the Merced River from its source to the town of Briceburg—about 82 miles—and the south fork of the Merced River from its source to the junction with the main stem—about 43 miles—as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The segment from Briceburg to the point of the maximum flood control pool of Lake McClure would be protected under the provisions of section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act until September 30, 1992.

The main stem of the Merced River originates in Yosemite National Park and flows through Yosemite Valley. From the western boundary of Yosemite Valley the river is within national forest on Bureau of Land Management boundaries with little private land along the river. State Highway 140 parallels the river from the town of Briceburg upstream to the Yosemite National Park boundary, and park roads parallel the river through Yosemite Valley. The main stem of the Merced River offers excellent fishing for its entire length, spectacular scenery in the more wild reaches, and an outstanding and heavily used recreation resource in the area of easy accessibility.

The south fork of the Merced River also has its source in Yosemite National Park and flows through the park for about 25 miles before entering national forest lands near the village of Wawona. The river is wholly within the boundary of the Sierra National Forest until it joins with the main stem 23 miles downstream.

The nationwide rivers inventory conducted by the Department of the Interior rated the south fork of the Merced as having more outstandingly remarkable values than any other California river. The upper river is located in a glaciated gorge and has numerous pools and cascades. The lower river falls rapidly through heavily forested areas and has a growing use by rafters, hikers, and fishermen. The river has an excellent native trout fishery and is a critical area habitat for deer, black bear, cougar, and other wildlife. There are several rare plant species found along the river.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on March 5, 1987, and the bill was favorably reported, with an amendment, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 18, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend and colleague of the Interior Committee, TONY COELHO, for his diligence and hard work in crafting this bill to protect one of the most beautiful rivers in the Sierra Nevada Mountains from adverse development that would forever destroy this remarkable stream. His commitment to environmental concerns has made it possible for us to bring this bill to the floor today and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 317.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 317, to designate 117 miles of the main stem and south fork of the Merced River in California as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The headwaters and a substantial portion of both segments are within Yosemite National Park. Both segments also flow through national forest lands, which are a part of the Sierra and Stanislaus National Forests. Approximately 17 miles of the river flows through designated wilderness.

In addition to the wild and scenic designation, H.R. 317 would establish a 5-year water development moratorium, rather than wild and scenic designation, for an additional 8 miles of the main stem of the Merced River to allow the local county adequate time to examine possible future water resources for the area. While the wild and scenic designation included in H.R. 317 would preclude licensing of a pending hydroelectric project on the main stem of the Merced, it does not appear that this project is necessary to meet current energy demands of the area. In addition, the National Park Service has expressed concern regarding the project's potential adverse effects on Yosemite National Park and the El Portal administrative site.

The Merced River was identified as a potential wild and scenic river in the 1982 nationwide rivers inventory by the National Park Service. In addition, it was recommended for designation by the Forest Service in the draft plan and environmental impact statement for the Sierra National Forest completed in September 1986. The river and corridor receive substantial recreation use, including rafting, hiking, camping, and picnicking. Finally, H.R. 317 would not affect private lands. There is very little private land within the river corridor and the Federal

managing agencies have indicated that an aggressive land acquisition policy is unnecessary.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. COELHO, the primary author, support H.R. 317 and urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO], a member of the committee.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to urge my colleagues to join with us in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation to designate an important river in my district, the Merced, as a wild and scenic river. For everyone who has had the opportunity to visit Yosemite National Park, they have been fortunate to see the beauty of the Merced.

This river begins in the park, travels down past the town of El Portal, through Mariposa County and on to Lake McClure. As it wanders along its path, one gets a close look at the high granite walls in the canyon that surround the river. Rare birds and other forms of wildlife are often seen on the river's shores and many varieties of plants and flowers can be found along the banks.

While the scenery is something to admire, the river offers a number of recreational opportunities to thousands each year. I have been fortunate enough to raft through the white water of the Merced during the summer months. I want others to be able to have the same experience, and to be able to use the river for hiking, fishing, and swimming.

One of the main reasons we need to pass this bill is to stop a proposed hydroelectric project that threatens the river. The project is planned for the very gateway to Yosemite National Park, and would substantially reduce the flow of the river. The benefits of the project are questionable, and there are very few people in Mariposa County who support it.

H.R. 317 would place approximately 125 miles of the main stem and South Fork of the Merced within the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. A moratorium on development would be placed on the lower part of the main stem from Briceburg to Bagby. This moratorium is intended to give officials of Mariposa County an opportunity to explore possible water options for the future.

I appreciate the support offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. VENTO, in moving H.R. 317 early in the session. I hope that our actions will show our children and grandchildren that Congress was committed to preserving part of a beautiful river so that they too can enjoy what we find so worthy of protection today.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I want to congratulate all the Members involved in bringing it to the floor.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is yet another important step in preserving and protecting our river resources within the policy outline of the wild and scenic rivers laws. Rivers are under enormous pressure, and we must as policymakers strive to act lest we see irrational development and irreversible actions which spell the loss of these fragile natural river systems. The Merced River certainly is a magnificent resource. Our committee visit in 1985 was a real eye opener for me and, I think, for some other Members. Of course, that action has led to the introduction of and the fostering of the legislation before us today. Positive action by this Congress is justified and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 317, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DEFENSE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1987

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1783) to make technical corrections in certain defense-related laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1783

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Technical Corrections Act of 1987".

##### SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO 99TH CONGRESS LAWS

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Defense Authorization Act" means the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987 (division A of Public Law 99-661; 100 Stat. 3816 et seq.).

(2) The term "Defense Appropriations Act" means the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 (as contained in identical form in section 101(c) of Public Law 99-500 (100 Stat. 1783-82 et seq.) and section 101(c) of Public Law 99-591 (100 Stat. 3341-82 et seq.)).

(3) The term "Defense Acquisition Improvement Act" means title X of the Defense Appropriations Act and title IX of the Defense Authorization Act (as designated by the amendment made by section 3(5)). Any reference in this Act to the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act shall be considered to be a reference to each such title.

##### SEC. 3. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The Defense Authorization Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 234(c) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking out "adding at the end" and inserting in lieu thereof "inserting after section 2363"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking out "adding at the end" and inserting in lieu thereof "inserting after the item relating to section 2363".

(2) Section 602(b) is amended by inserting "of section 1006" after "Subsection (j)".

(3) Sections 643(a) and 644(a) are amended by striking out "such title" and inserting in lieu thereof "title 10, United States Code".

(4) Section 651(a)(2) is amended by striking out "of" before "the following".

(5) The title heading preceding section 900 is amended by striking out "TITLE IV" and inserting in lieu thereof "TITLE IX".

(6) Section 1343(a)(1) is amended by striking out "section 775 (as redesignated by section [502])" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 774".

(7) Section 1343(a)(23) is amended by striking out "Section 5155(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 5150(c) (as redesignated by section 514(a)(2) of Public Law 99-433)".

(8) Section 1343(a)(25) is amended by inserting "(as added by section 806(b) of Public Law 99-399) after "Section 1051(d)".

(9) Section 1355 is amended by striking out "subsections" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection".

(10) Section 1404(c)(2) is amended by striking out "clause (2) or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (1) or (2)".

##### SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

(a) PAYMENT DATE FOR PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—(1) Paragraph (3) of section 9103 of the Defense Appropriations Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Section 1466(a) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by section 661(b) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-661)), is amended by striking out 'paid that month to' in paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof 'accrued for that month by'."

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking out "Section 1013" and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 1014"; and

(B) by striking out "subsection (a), and the amendment made by subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) and redesignated by section 8(b)(2) of the Defense Technical Corrections Act of 1987, and the amendments made by paragraph (3)".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 909(a) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" before "Chapter 139".

##### SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENT ACT

The Defense Acquisition Improvement Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 906(b) is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "section 2437(c) of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)(1))".

(2) Section 908(c) is amended by striking out "this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (a) and (b)".

(3) Section 909 is amended—

(A) by striking out "by adding after section 2364 (as added by section 234)" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "by adding at the end"; and

(B) by striking out "by adding after the item relating to section 2364 (as added by

section 234)" in subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "by adding at the end".

(4) Section 926(a)(2) is amended by inserting "of such title" after "chapter 137".

(5) Section 932(d) is repealed.

(6) Section 954(a)(2) is amended by striking out "section 971" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 951".

##### SEC. 6. CONSTRUCTION OF DUPLICATE AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION PROVISIONS

(a) RULE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS.—(1) In applying the provisions of Public Laws 99-500, 99-591, and 99-661 described in paragraph (2)—

(A) the identical provisions of those public laws referred to in such paragraph shall be treated as having been enacted only once, and

(B) in executing to the United States Code and other statutes of the United States the amendments made by such identical provisions, such amendments shall be executed so as to appear only once in the law as amended.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to the provisions of the Defense Appropriations Act and the Defense Authorization Act (as amended by sections 3, 4, 5, and 10(a)) referred to across from each other in the following table:

Section 101(c) of Public Law 99-500	Section 101(c) of Public Law 99-591	Division A of Public Law 99- 661
Title X Sec. 9122 Sec. 9036(b) Sec. 9115	Title X Sec. 9122 Sec. 9036(b) Sec. 9115	Title IX Sec. 522 Sec. 1203 Sec. 1311

(b) RULE FOR DATE OF ENACTMENT.—(1) The date of the enactment of the provisions of law listed in the middle column, and in the right-hand column, of the table in subsection (a)(2) shall be deemed to be October 18, 1986 (the date of the enactment of Public Law 99-500).

(2) Any reference in a provision of law referred to in paragraph (1) to "the date of the enactment of this Act" shall be treated as a reference to October 18, 1986.

##### SEC. 7. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

(a) TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 138(c) (as amended by section 903(c)(4) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by striking out "to the Secretary" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "to the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and shall be accompanied by such comments as the Secretary may wish to make on the report."

(2) Section 867(g)(1) is amended by striking out "the Director, Judge Advocate Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps".

(3) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 1466 as in effect before the enactment of the Defense Appropriations Act is hereby reenacted as a flush sentence at the end of such subsection.

(4) Section 2320(a) (as amended by section 953(a) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended—

(A) by inserting after "Federal funds" in paragraph (2)(A) the following: "(other than an item or process developed under a



contract or subcontract to which regulations under section 9(j)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)(2)) apply"; and

(B) by striking out "of the United States in technical data pertaining to an item or process developed entirely or in part with Federal funds" in paragraph (2)(G)(ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "in technical data otherwise accorded to the United States under such regulations".

(5)(A) Section 2321 (as amended by section 953(b) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (e) through (h), respectively; and

(ii) by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) **CONTRACTS COVERED BY SECTION.**—This section applies to any contract for supplies or services entered into by the Department of Defense that includes provisions for the delivery of technical data.

"(b) **CONTRACTOR JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTRICTIONS.**—A contract subject to this section shall provide that a contractor under the contract and any subcontractor under the contract at any tier shall be prepared to furnish to the contracting officer a written justification for any use or release restriction (as defined in subsection (i)) asserted by the contractor or subcontractor.

"(c) **REVIEW OF RESTRICTIONS.**—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that there is a thorough review of the appropriateness of any use or release restriction asserted with respect to technical data by a contractor or subcontractor at any tier under a contract subject to this section.

"(2) The review of an asserted use or release restriction under paragraph (1) shall be conducted before the end of the three-year period beginning on the later of—

"(A) the date on which final payment is made on the contract under which the technical data is required to be delivered; or

"(B) the date on which the technical data is delivered under the contract.

"(d) **CHALLENGES TO RESTRICTIONS.**—(1) The Secretary of Defense may challenge a use or release restriction asserted with respect to technical data by a contractor or subcontractor at any tier under a contract subject to this section if the Secretary finds that—

"(A) reasonable grounds exist to question the current validity of the asserted restriction; and

"(B) the continued adherence by the United States to the asserted restriction would make it impracticable to procure the item to which the technical data pertain competitively at a later time.

"(2)(A) A challenge to an asserted use or release restriction may not be made under paragraph (1) after the end of the three-year period described in subparagraph (B) unless the technical data involved—

"(i) are publicly available;

"(ii) have been furnished to the United States without restriction; or

"(iii) have been otherwise made available without restriction.

"(B) The three-year period referred to in subparagraph (A) is the three-year period beginning on the later of—

"(i) the date on which final payment is made on the contract under which the technical data are required to be delivered; or

"(ii) the date on which the technical data are delivered under the contract.

"(3) If the Secretary challenges an asserted use or release restriction under para-

graph (1), the Secretary shall provide written notice of the challenge to the contractor or subcontractor asserting the restriction. Any such notice shall—

"(A) state the specific grounds for challenging the asserted restriction;

"(B) require a response within 60 days justifying the current validity of the asserted restriction; and

"(C) state that evidence of a justification described in paragraph (4) may be submitted.

"(4) It is a justification of an asserted use or release restriction challenged under paragraph (1) that, within the three-year period preceding the challenge to the restriction, the Department of Defense validated a restriction identical to the asserted restriction if—

"(A) such validation occurred after a challenge to the validated restriction under this paragraph; and

"(B) the validated restriction was asserted by the same contractor or subcontractor (or a licensee of such contractor or subcontractor)."

(B) Subsection (e) of such section (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)(i)) is amended by striking out "If a contractor or subcontractor asserting a restriction subject to this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "TIME FOR CONTRACTORS TO SUBMIT JUSTIFICATIONS.—If a contractor or subcontractor asserting a use or release restriction".

(C) Subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)(i)) is amended—

(i) by striking out "(1) Upon" and inserting in lieu thereof "DECISION BY CONTRACTING OFFICER.—(1) Upon"; and

(ii) by striking out "subsection (b)" in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (d)(3)".

(D) Subsection (g) of such section (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)(i)) is amended by inserting "CLAIMS.—" after "(g)".

(E) Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)(i)) is amended—

(i) by inserting "RIGHTS AND LIABILITY UPON FINAL DISPOSITION.—" after "(h)";

(ii) by striking out "the restriction on the right of the United States to use such technical data" in the matter in paragraph (1) preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "the use or release restriction";

(iii) by striking out "on the right of the United States to use the technical data" in paragraph (1)(A);

(iv) by striking out "as appropriate," in paragraph (1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "asserting the restriction"; and

(v) by striking out "the restriction on the right of the United States to use such technical data" in the matter in paragraph (2) preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "the use or release restriction".

(G) Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) **USE OR RELEASE RESTRICTION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term 'use or release restriction', with respect to technical data delivered to the United States under a contract subject to this section, means a restriction by the contractor on the right of the United States—

"(1) to use such technical data; or

"(2) to release or disclose such technical data to persons outside the Government or permit the use of such technical data by persons outside the Government."

(6) Section 2322(b) is amended by striking out "two years" and all that follows and in-

serting in lieu thereof "on January 17, 1987".

(7)(A) Section 2328 (as added by section 954(a) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1)—

(I) by striking out "technical data to a person requesting such a" and inserting in lieu thereof "such technical data to the person requesting the"; and

(II) by striking out "search and duplication" and inserting in lieu thereof "search, duplication, and review";

(ii) by striking out "DISPOSITION OF COSTS" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "CREDITING OF RECEIPTS"; and

(iii) by striking out "section 552(a)(4)(A)" in subsection (c)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 552(a)(4)(A)(iii)".

(B)(i) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"2328. Release of technical data under Freedom of Information Act: recovery of costs".

(ii) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 is amended to read as follows:

"2328. Release of technical data under Freedom of Information Act: recovery of costs."

(8) The heading of chapter 138 is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 138—ACQUISITION AND CROSS-SERVICING AGREEMENTS WITH NATO ALLIES AND OTHER COUNTRIES".

(9) Section 2364(c) (as added by section 234(c) of the Defense Authorization Act) is amended—

(A) by striking out "a decision" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "the decision";

(B) by striking out "[a] [the] selection by an appropriate official of the Department of Defense of" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "the decision by an appropriate official of the Department of Defense selecting"; and

(C) by striking out "approval by an appropriate official of the Department of Defense for" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "the decision by an appropriate official of the Department of Defense approving".

(10) Subsection (d) of section 3036 (as amended by section 922 of Public Law 99-662) is amended—

(A) by designating the first sentence as paragraph (1);

(B) by designating the second sentence as paragraph (2); and

(C) by striking out "United States" and all that follows in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"United States or to a State or political subdivision of a State. The Chief of Engineers may provide any part of those services by contract. Services may be provided to a State, or to a political subdivision of a State, only if—

"(A) the work to be undertaken on behalf of non-Federal interests involves Federal assistance and the head of the department or agency providing Federal assistance for the work does not object to the provision of services by the Chief of Engineers; and

"(B) the services are provided on a reimbursable basis."

(b) **MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.**—Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 101(a) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433)) is amended as follows:

(1) The heading of such chapter is amended to read as follows:

**"CHAPTER 144—MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS"**

(2)(A) Such chapter is amended by inserting after the table of sections the following new section:

"§ 2430. Major defense acquisition program defined

"In this chapter, the term 'major defense acquisition program' means a Department of Defense acquisition program that is not a highly sensitive classified program (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) and—

"(1) that is designated by the Secretary of Defense as a major defense acquisition program; or

"(2) that is estimated by the Secretary of Defense to require an eventual total expenditure for research, development, test, and evaluation of more than \$200,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars) or an eventual total expenditure for procurement of more than \$1,000,000,000 (based on fiscal year 1980 constant dollars)."

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of the chapter is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 2431 the following new item:

"2430. Major defense acquisition program defined."

(3) Section 2432 (as redesignated by section 101(a)(5) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433)), is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(B) by striking out "programed" each place such term appears in subsection (a)(2), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), and inserting in lieu thereof "programmed".

(4) Section 2433(a)(1) (as redesignated by section 101(a)(5) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433)), is amended by striking out "(1) 'Major defense acquisition program', 'program' and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) The terms 'program'."

(5) Section 2434(b) (as redesignated by section 101(a)(5) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433) and amended by section 1208 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987 (division A of Public Law 99-861)) is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraph (1); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(6) Section 2435 (as added by section 904(a) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by striking out subsection (c).

(7) Section 2436(d)(3) (as added by section 905(a)(1) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by inserting a comma after "In this subsection".

(8) Section 2437(a)(1) (as added by section 906(a)(1) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)".

(9)(A) Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is transferred to the end of such chapter 144, redesignated as section 2438, and amended—

(i) by striking out "program," in subsection (d)(1) and all that follows in that subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "program."; and

(ii) by striking out "section 2432(a)(1)(B)" both places it appears in subsection (d)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2430(2)".

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of such title is transferred to the end of the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 144 of such title and revised to reflect the redesignation of such section made by subparagraph (A).

(C) CLERICAL AND CONFORMING CROSS-REFERENCE AMENDMENTS.—(1) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part IV of subtitle A, of title 10, United States Code, are each amended—

(A) by striking out the item in each such table relating to chapter 138 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"138. Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements with NATO Allies and Other Countries..... 2341";

(B) by striking out the item in each such table relating to chapter 144 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"144. Major Defense Acquisition Programs..... 2430";

(C) by striking out "2701" in the item relating to chapter 161 and inserting in lieu thereof "2721".

(2) Sections 138(a)(2)(B) and 1621(3) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by section 110(g) of Public Law 99-433), are amended by striking out "section 2432(a)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2430".

(d) UNITED STATES CODE CITATIONS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 113(e)(2) (as amended by section 603(b) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433; 100 Stat. 1075)) is amended by inserting "(50 U.S.C. 404a)" after "National Security Act of 1947".

(2) Section 2208(i)(3) is amended by inserting "(22 U.S.C. 2778)" after "section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act".

(3) Section 2304 is amended—

(A) by inserting "(41 U.S.C. 403 note)" in subsections (a)(1)(A) and (g)(1) after "Competition in Contracting Act of 1984"; and

(B) by inserting "(41 U.S.C. 416)" in subsection (f)(1)(C) after "Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act".

(4) Section 2318 is amended—

(A) by inserting "(41 U.S.C. 418(a))" in subsection (a)(1) after "Policy Act";

(B) by inserting "(41 U.S.C. 418(b), (c))" in subsection (a)(2) after "Policy Act"; and

(C) by inserting "(41 U.S.C. 419)" in the second sentence of subsection (c) after "Policy Act";

(5) Section 2319 is amended—

(A) by inserting "(15 U.S.C. 637(b)(7))" in subsection (c)(4) after "the Small Business Act"; and

(B) by inserting "(15 U.S.C. 632)" in subsection (d)(2) after "the Small Business Act".

(6) Section 2664(a)(3) is amended by inserting "App." after "46 U.S.C."

(e) DUPLICATE SECTION DESIGNATIONS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1)(A) Section 1051, as added by section 806(b)(1) of Public Law 99-399 and amended by section 1343(a)(25) of the Defense Authorization Act, is redesignated as section 1032 and is transferred within chapter 53 to appear immediately after section 1031.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 is amended—

(i) by inserting after the item relating to section 1031 the following new item:

"1032. Disability and death compensation: dependents of members held as captives."; and

(ii) by striking out the item relating to the second section 1051.

(2) Section 1095, as added by section 806(c)(1) of Public Law 99-399, is redesignated as section 1095a, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 is amended to reflect such redesignation.

(3) Section 2810, as added by section 315(a) of the Defense Authorization Act, is redesignated as section 2811, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 169 is revised to reflect that redesignation.

(f) REFERENCES TO REAL ESTATE MINOR CONSTRUCTION AMOUNT.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Sections 2233a(a)(2)(B)(ii)(II), 2806(c)(1), and 2861(b)(6) are amended by striking out "specified by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "specified by section 2805(a)(2) of this title".

(2) Section 2853 is amended—

(A) by striking out "the amount specified by law as the maximum amount for a minor military construction project" the first place such term appears in subsection (a)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "the minor project ceiling (as defined in subsection (f))";

(B) by striking out "the amount specified by law as the maximum amount for a minor military construction project" each place such term appears (other than as specified in subparagraph (A)) and inserting in lieu thereof "the minor project ceiling";

(C) by striking out "such maximum amount" both places it appears in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of such ceiling"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) In this section, the term 'minor project ceiling' means the amount specified by section 2805(a)(2) of this title as the maximum amount for a minor military construction project."

(g) INTERNAL CROSS-REFERENCES.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 2313(d)(1) is amended by striking out "section 2306(f)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2306a".

(2) Section 2343(b) is amended by striking out "2306(f)," and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2306a".

(3) Section 8062(e) (as amended by section 110(g)(10) of the Public Law 99-433) is amended by striking out "section 114" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 115".

(h) REFERENCES TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954.—(1) The following sections of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "Internal Revenue Code of 1986": sections 1403, 1408(a)(4)(D), 1451(e)(4)(B)(ii), and 2401(d)(1)(B).

(2)(A) The heading of section 1403 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1403. Disability retired pay: treatment under Internal Revenue Code of 1986."

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of



chapter 71 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1403. Disability retired pay: treatment under Internal Revenue Code of 1986."

(i) ENACTMENT DATE REFERENCES.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Sections 101(44), 101(45), and 191(b) are amended by striking out "the date of the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(2) Section 708(d)(1) is amended by striking out "the date of the enactment of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 19, 1984".

(3) Section 2031(a) is amended by striking out "beginning with the calendar year 1966".

(4) Section 2319(c) is amended by striking out "the date of the enactment of the Defense Procurement Reform Act of 1984" in paragraphs (1) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 19, 1984".

(j) CAPITALIZATION, PUNCTUATION, ETC. AMENDMENTS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 114 (as added by section 105(d) of the Defense Authorization Act) is redesignated as subsection (e).

(2) Section 115(b)(1)(B)(vii) (as added by section 413(2) of the Defense Authorization Act) is amended by striking out "members" and inserting in lieu thereof "Members".

(3) Section 1208(a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "clause (1)" and "clause (2)," and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1)" and "paragraph (2)," respectively; and

(B) by striking out "clause (2)(B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (2)".

(4) The heading of section 1623 (as amended by section 1343(a)(10) of the Defense Authorization Act) is amended by striking out "flag and general" and inserting in lieu thereof "general and flag".

(5) Section 2397 is amended—

(A) by striking out "3-year" in subsection (b)(1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "three-year";

(B) by striking out "2-year" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "two-year"; and

(C) by striking out "United States Code" in the second sentence of subsection (f)(2).

(6) Subsection (f) of section 2634 (as added by section 620(b)(2) of the Defense Authorization Act) is redesignated as subsection (d).

(7)(A) The heading of section 2774 is amended by striking out "allowances, and" and inserting in lieu thereof "allowances and of".

(B) Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out "as defined in section 101(3) of title 37,".

(C) The item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 is amended to read as follows:

"2774. Claims for overpayment of pay and allowances and of travel and transportation allowances."

(8) Section 2828 is amended by striking out "Armed Forces" in subsections (a)(1) and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "armed forces".

(9) Section 2861(b)(7) is amended by inserting "of this title" after "section 2858".

(10)(A) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle B, and at the beginning of part I of subtitle B, are each amended by striking out "3010" in the item relating to

chapter 303 and inserting in lieu thereof "3011".

(B) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle D, and at the beginning of part I of subtitle D, are each amended by striking out "8010" in the item relating to chapter 803 and inserting in lieu thereof "8011".

(11) Sections 4723 and 8723 (as amended by section 604(f)(1)(D) of the Defense Authorization Act) are amended by striking out the comma after "disease".

(j) DEFINITIONS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 is amended—

(A) by inserting "The term" in each paragraph (other than paragraph (2)) after the paragraph designation;

(B) by inserting "the term" in paragraph (2) after "United States," the second place it appears; and

(C) by revising the first word after the open quotation marks in each paragraph (other than paragraphs (1), (8) through (13), (44), and (45)) so that the initial letter of such word is lower case.

(2) Sections 976(a), 1045(e), 1587(a), 1621, 2006(b), 2120, 2213(e), 2232, 2302 (other than paragraph (3)), 2305a(d), 2350, 2362(e), 2394(c), 2397(a), 2397a(a), 2403(a), 2432(a), 2547(e), 2801(c), and 5001(a) are amended—

(A) by inserting "The term" in each paragraph after the paragraph designation; and

(B) by revising the first word after the first quotation marks in each paragraph (other than in sections 1045(e), 2006(b)(1), 2213(e)(2), 2232(1), 2350(2), 2801(c)(3), 5001(a)(1), and 5001(a)(2)) so that the initial letter of such word is lower case.

(3) Sections 130(b)(2), 708(e), 975(a)(2), 1490(c), 2319(a), 2324(k), 2391(d), 2401a(d), 2404(e), 2825(a)(2), 2826(f), and 2862(a)(2) are amended by inserting "the term" after "In this section,".

(4) Section 276(b) is amended by inserting "the term" after "In this section,".

(5) Sections 1126(d) and 7420 are amended—

(A) by striking out the dash in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon;

(B) by inserting "The term" in each paragraph after the paragraph designation;

(C) by striking out the semicolon at the end of each of paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(D) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(6) Section 2181 is amended—

(A) by striking out "Captive" and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'captive'; and

(B) by striking out "Dependent" and inserting in lieu thereof "The term 'dependent'".

(7) Section 2433(a) is amended—

(A) by inserting "The term" in paragraphs (2) and (4) after the paragraph designation; and

(B) by striking out "(3) 'Procurement'" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) The term 'procurement'".

(8) Section 3001 is amended by inserting "the term" after "In this title,".

(9) Section 7430(l) is amended by striking out "As used in" and inserting in lieu thereof "In".

(10) Section 7721(b) is amended by inserting "the term" after "In this chapter".

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

(a) CONFLICTING PROVISIONS.—The amendments made to section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by section 614(a) of the

Defense Authorization Act shall be executed as if that portion of section 9073 of the Defense Appropriations Act which is before the proviso had not been enacted, and such amendments shall be effective as provided in section 614(b) of the Defense Authorization Act. Such portion of section 9073 which is before the proviso shall not be in effect after the date of the enactment of this Act, and the reference to "this section" in such proviso shall be deemed to refer to section 614 of the Defense Authorization Act.

(b) DUPLICATE SECTION DESIGNATIONS.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 431, as added by section 615 of the Defense Authorization Act, is redesignated as section 432, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is revised to reflect that redesignation.

(2) Section 1013, as added by section 9103 of the Defense Appropriations Act, is redesignated as section 1014, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 19 of such title is revised to reflect that redesignation.

(c) REFERENCE TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954.—Section 558 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "Internal Revenue Code of 1986".

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 301(b) is amended by striking out "Monthly rate" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Monthly Rate".

(2) Section 302a is amended—

(A) by striking out "a" at the beginning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "A";

(B) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "or";

(C) by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(D) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(3) Section 303 is amended—

(A) by striking out "a" at the beginning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "A";

(B) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "or";

(C) by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof a period;

(D) by striking out the comma at the end of paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(E) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(4) Section 308i is amended in subsection (b)(1)(B) by inserting a comma after "\$2,500".

(5) Section 403(l)(1) is amended by striking out "Armed Forces" and inserting in lieu thereof "armed forces".

(6) Sections 404(d)(1)(A) and 408 are amended by striking out "privately-owned" and inserting in lieu thereof "privately owned".

(7) Section 406 is amended—

(A) by striking out "round trip" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "round-trip"; and

(B) by striking out "roundtrip" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "round-trip".

(8) Section 411b(a) is amended by striking out "forty-eight" each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "48".

(9) Section 411c(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out "roundtrip" and inserting in lieu thereof "round-trip"; and

(B) by striking out "roundtrips" and inserting in lieu thereof "round-trips".

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Title 37, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 is amended—

(A) by striking out "for the purposes of this title—" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following definitions apply in this title:";

(B) by inserting "The term" in each paragraph after the paragraph designation;

(C) by revising the first word after the open quotation marks in each paragraph (other than paragraphs (1) and (6) through (10)) so that the initial letter of such word is lower case;

(D) by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraphs (1) through (24) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(E) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (24).

(2) Section 301 is amended—

(A) by striking out "For the purposes of this subsection," in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "In this subsection, the term"; and

(B) by striking out "paragraph" in subsection (f)(2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph, the term".

(3) Section 301a(6) is amended—

(A) by striking out "For the purposes of this section, the term—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In this section:";

(B) by inserting "The term" in each subparagraph after the subparagraph designation;

(C) by striking out the semicolon at the end of subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(D) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B).

(4) Section 301c(a)(5) is amended—

(A) by striking out "For the purposes of this section, the term—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In this section:";

(B) by inserting "The term" in subparagraphs (A) and (B) after each subparagraph designation; and

(C) by revising the first word after the open quotation marks in subparagraphs (A) and (B) so that the initial letter of such word is lower case.

(5) Section 305a(d) is amended by striking out "For the purposes of this section," and inserting in lieu thereof "In this section,".

(6) Sections 315, 409(e), 411d(d), and 501(a) are amended by inserting "the term" after "In this section,".

(7) Section 401 is amended by inserting "the term" after "In this chapter,".

(8) Section 403a(c)(6)(B) is amended by inserting "the term" after "In subparagraph (A)."

(9) Section 501(g) is amended in the last sentence by inserting "the term" before the open quotation marks each place they appear.

(10) Section 551 is amended—

(A) by striking out "In this chapter—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In this chapter:";

(B) by inserting "The term" in each paragraph after the paragraph designation;

(C) by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(D) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2).

(11) Section 559(a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "In this section—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In this section:";

(B) by inserting "The term" in paragraphs (1) and (2) after the paragraph designation; and

(C) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

#### SEC. 9. RECODIFICATION OF CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE PROVISIONS

(a) RECODIFICATION.—(1) Part I of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

#### "CHAPTER 21—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

"Sec.

"421. Funds transfers for foreign cryptologic support.

"422. Counterintelligence official reception and representation expenses.

"423. Authority to use proceeds from counterintelligence operations of the military department."

(2) Section 128 of such title (as redesignated by section 101 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433)) is transferred to the end of chapter 21 of such title (as added by paragraph (1)) and is redesignated as section 421.

(3) Sections 140a and 140b of such title (as added by sections 401 and 403, respectively, of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (Public Law 99-569)) are transferred to the end of such chapter and redesignated as sections 422 and 423, respectively.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 128.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 4 of such title is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 140a and 140b (as added by sections 401 and 403, respectively, of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987).

(3) Section 423 of such title (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) is amended by striking out "United States Code," in subsection (a).

(4) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part I of subtitle A, of such title are amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 20 (as added by section 333(a)(2) of the Defense Authorization Act) the following new item:

"21. Department of Defense Intelligence Matters..... 421".

#### SEC. 10. CORRECTIONS TO SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS

(a) DEFENSE ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 921 of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a)(1) is amended by striking out "paragraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause".

(2) Subsection (h)(3) is amended by striking out "value of contracts to be awarded under such sections" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "dollar value of the contracts to be awarded in that industry category".

(3) Subsection (j) is amended by striking out "construction" and all that follows in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "construction by Great Lakes Naval Train-

ing Center, Illinois, and of the total dollar amount of the contracts awarded for fiscal year 1987 for refuse systems and related services by such training center, not more than 30 percent of each such dollar amount may be under contracts awarded through so-called small business set-aside programs."

(b) SMALL BUSINESS ACT.—(1) Section 15(o) of the Small Business Act (as added by section 921(c)(2) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended—

(A) by striking out "the concern" in paragraph (1)(A) and all that follows through "employees" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 50 percent of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel shall be expended for employees of the concern"; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking out "subparagraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The percentage applicable to any such requirement shall be determined in accordance with paragraph (2)."

(2)(A) Paragraph (3) of section 3(a) of such Act (as added by section 921(f) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by striking out "value of contracts to be awarded under such sections" and inserting in lieu thereof "dollar value of the contracts to be awarded in that industry category".

(B) Paragraph (4)(A)(i) of such section is amended by striking out "paragraph (3)(A)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (3)".

(C) Paragraph (5) of such section is amended by striking out "made with the expiration of 180 days after each" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be made not later than 180 days after the end of each such".

(3) Paragraph (14) of section 8(a) of such Act (as added by section 921(c)(1) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act) is amended by striking out "section 15(n)" in subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 15(o)".

#### SEC. 11. OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

(a) CROSS-REFERENCE CORRECTIONS.—(1) Section 1243(a) of the Defense Procurement Reform Act of 1984 (title XII of Public Law 98-525; 98 Stat. 2609) is amended by striking out "section 139a(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2430".

(2) Section 915(d) of the Defense Procurement Improvement Act of 1985 (title IX of Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 688) is amended by striking out "section 139a(a)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2430".

(b) PUBLIC LAW 99-433.—Section 523(c)(1) of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 1063) by striking out "section" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections".

#### SEC. 12. EFFECTIVE DATES

(a) PUBLIC LAW 99-661.—The amendments made by section 3 shall apply as if included in Public Law 99-661 when enacted on November 14, 1986.

(b) PUBLIC LAWS 99-500 AND 99-591.—The amendments made by section 4 shall apply as if included in Public Laws 99-500 and 99-591 when enacted on October 18, 1986, and October 30, 1986, respectively.

(c) DEFENSE ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENT ACT.—The amendments made by sections 5 and 10 shall apply as if included in each instance of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act (as specified in section 2) when each was enacted.



(d) **TECHNICAL DATA.**—(1) The amendments to section 2321 of title 10, United States Code, made by section 7(a)(5) shall apply to contracts for which solicitations are issued after the end of the 210-day period beginning on October 18, 1986.

(2) The amendment to section 2328 of such title made by section 7(a)(7)(A)(i)(II) shall take effect on the same date and in the same manner as provided in section 1804(b) of Public Law 99-570 for the amendment made by section 1803 of that Public Law to section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **DICKINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. **FOGLIETTA**] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. **DICKINSON**] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. **FOGLIETTA**].

Mr. **FOGLIETTA**. Mr. Speaker, I defer to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. **DICKINSON**].

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. **DICKINSON**].

Mr. **DICKINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. I can assure the Members that there are no substantive changes in this bill—it is truly a technical corrections bill. Those Members who have had the opportunity to look at the bill will have realized that about 90 percent of the provisions in it relate to changing section numbers, moving provisions within title 10 to make the organization of the Code better, and generally just dotting i's and crossing t's. It's not a very exciting thing, but extremely important, and I, along with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, would like to thank Bob Cover in the legislative counsel's office for his tireless efforts to ensure our legislative endeavors are correct in form as well as substance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **FOGLIETTA**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. As is often the case, we find that there were instances in which provisions of laws enacted last year contained drafting errors or lacked clarity. The Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 was no exception. The purpose of this bill is to make technical corrections to that act, and to address problems caused by the dual enactment of sever-

al provisions in both the authorization act and the continuing resolution.

The dual enactment occurred because at the time the continuing resolution was being considered it was unclear whether in fact an authorization bill would be agreed upon. In order to protect the work of the committee in the procurement reform area, the Appropriations Committee agreed to include the entire procurement reform package in the continuing resolution. Because the continuing resolution had to be signed a second time these provisions were actually enacted three times. This bill would treat the provisions as having been enacted only once for purposes of printing in the United States Code and make them effective on the date first passed.

Most of the provisions of this bill are to make stylistic changes in title 10 such as changing a word from singular to plural, capitalizing a section heading, adding United States Code cites, or putting in specific effective dates where the effective date is now known. Finally, there are several changes to the DOD Authorization Act which are necessary to correct drafting errors or ambiguities.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **DICKINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. **FOGLIETTA**. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. **FOGLIETTA**] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1783, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **MAVROULES**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

□ 1620

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. **GRAY** of Illinois). Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Concurrent Resolution 34, de novo; and House Resolution 121, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

#### CONCERNING VIOLATIONS BY THE SOVIET UNION OF ITS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. **YATRON**] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The question was taken.

Mr. **GRANDY**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER pro tempore**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—415

Ackerman	Boland	Coble
Akaka	Boner (TN)	Coelho
Alexander	Bonior (MI)	Coleman (MO)
Anderson	Bonker	Collins
Andrews	Borski	Combest
Anthony	Bosco	Conte
Applegate	Boucher	Conyers
Archer	Boulter	Cooper
Armey	Boxer	Coughlin
Aspin	Brennan	Courter
Atkins	Brooks	Coyne
AuCoin	Broomfield	Craig
Badham	Brown (CO)	Crane
Baker	Bruce	Crockett
Ballenger	Buechner	Darden
Barnard	Bunning	Daub
Bartlett	Burton	Davis (IL)
Barton	Bustamante	Davis (MI)
Bateman	Byron	de la Garza
Bates	Callahan	DeFazio
Bellenson	Campbell	DeLay
Bennett	Cardin	Dellums
Bentley	Carper	DeWine
Bereuter	Carr	Dickinson
Berman	Chandler	Dicks
Bevill	Chapman	Dingell
Biaggi	Chappell	DioGuardi
Bilbray	Cheney	Dixon
Billirakis	Clarke	Donnelly
Bliley	Clay	Dorgan (ND)
Boehlert	Clinger	Dornan (CA)
Boggs	Coats	Dowdy

Downey Kleczka  
Dreier Kolbe  
Duncan Koller  
Durbun Konnyu  
Dwyer Kostmayer  
Dymally Kyl  
Dyson LaFalce  
Early Lagomarsino  
Eckart Lancaster  
Edwards (CA) Lantos  
Emerson Latta  
English Leach (IA)  
Erdreich Leath (TX)  
Espy Lehman (CA)  
Evans Lehman (FL)  
Fascell Leland  
Fawell Lent  
Fazio Levin (MI)  
Fields Levine (CA)  
Fish Lewis (CA)  
Flake Lewis (FL)  
Flippo Lewis (GA)  
Florio Lightfoot  
Foglietta Lipinski  
Foley Livingston  
Ford (MI) Lloyd  
Ford (TN) Lott  
Frank Lowery (CA)  
Frenzel Lowry (WA)  
Frost Lujan  
Gallegly Luken, Thomas  
Gallo Lukens, Donald  
Garcia Lungren  
Gaydos Mack  
Gejdenson MacKay  
Gekas Madigan  
Gibbons Manton  
Gilman Markey  
Gingrich Marlenee  
Glickman Martin (IL)  
Goodling Martin (NY)  
Gordon Martinez  
Gradison Matsui  
Grandy Mavroules  
Grant Mazzoli  
Gray (IL) McCandless  
Gray (PA) McCloskey  
Green McCollum  
Gregg McCurdy  
Guarini McDade  
Gunderson McEwen  
Hall (OH) McGrath  
Hall (TX) McHugh  
Hamilton McKinney  
Hammerschmidt McMillan (NC)  
Hansen McMillan (MD)  
Harris Meyers  
Hastert Mfume  
Hatcher Mica  
Hawkins Michel  
Hayes (IL) Miller (CA)  
Hayes (LA) Miller (OH)  
Hefley Miller (WA)  
Hefner Mineta  
Henry Moakley  
Herger Molinari  
Hertel Molohan  
Hiller Montgomery  
Hochbrueckner Moody  
Holloway Moorhead  
Hopkins Morella  
Horton Morrison (WA)  
Houghton Mrazek  
Howard Murphy  
Hoyer Murtha  
Hubbard Myers  
Hughes Nagle  
Hunter Natcher  
Hutto Neal  
Hyde Nelson  
Inhofe Nichols  
Ireland Nielson  
Jacobs Nowak  
Jeffords Oaker  
Johnson (CT) Oberstar  
Jones (NC) Obey  
Jones (TN) Olin  
Jontz Ortiz  
Kanjorski Owens (NY)  
Kaptur Owens (UT)  
Kasich Oxley  
Kastenmeier Packard  
Kemp Panetta  
Kennedy Parris  
Kennelly Pashayan  
Kildee Patterson

Towns Walgren  
Traficant Walker  
Traxler Watkins  
Udall Waxman  
Upton Weber  
Valentine Weiss  
Vander Jagt Weldon  
Vento Wheat  
Visclosky Whittaker  
Volkmer Whitten  
Vucanovich Williams

Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wortley  
Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Bonker  
Borski  
Bosco  
Boucher  
Boxer  
Brennan  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Bustamante  
Callahan  
Campbell  
Cardin  
Carr  
Chandler  
Chapman  
Chappell  
Clarke  
Cling  
Clinger  
Coelho  
Coleman (MO)  
Collins  
Conte  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Coughlin  
Courter  
Coyne  
Crane  
Crockett  
Darden  
Davis (MI)  
Davis (GA)  
DeFazio  
Dellums  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dingell  
DioGuardi  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Downey  
Duncan  
Dwyer  
Dymally  
Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Espy  
Evans  
Fascell  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fish  
Flake  
Florio  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank  
Frenzel  
Frost  
Gallo  
Garcia  
Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Gradison  
Gray (IL)  
Gray (PA)  
Green  
Guarini  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Hatcher  
Hawkins  
Hayes (IL)

Hefner  
Hertel  
Hiller  
Hochbrueckner  
Horton  
Houghton  
Howard  
Hoyer  
Hubbard  
Hughes  
Hyde  
Jeffords  
Johnson (CT)  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (TN)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kastenmeier  
Kemp  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Kolbe  
Koller  
Konnyu  
Kostmayer  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
Latta  
Leach (IA)  
Leath (TX)  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Leland  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lloyd  
Lowry (WA)  
Luken, Thomas  
MacKay  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
McCollum  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McKinney  
McMillan (NC)  
McMillan (MD)  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Mineta  
Moakley  
Molohan  
Moody  
Morella  
Morrison (WA)  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Nagle  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nielson  
Nowak  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Ortiz  
Owens (NY)  
Owens (UT)  
Oxley  
Packard  
Panetta  
Parris  
Pashayan  
Patterson

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

## NOT VOTING—17

Annunzio  
Brown (CA)  
Bryant  
Coleman (TX)  
Daniel  
Dannemeyer  
Derrick  
Edwards (OK)  
Feighan  
Gephardt  
Huckaby  
Jenkins  
Johnson (SD)  
Morrison (CT)  
Ridge  
Rostenkowski  
Smith, Denny  
(OR)

□ 1640

Mr. SCHUMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## COMMENDING THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TREATY OF ROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 121.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 121) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 147, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

## YEAS—269

Ackerman  
Akaka  
Alexander  
Anderson  
Andrews  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Army  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Barnard  
Bateman  
Bates  
Beilenson  
Bennett  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Blaggi  
Blibray  
Billey  
Boehlert  
Boggs  
Boland  
Boner (TN)  
Bonior (MI)

Archer  
Badham  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bentley  
Bilirakis  
Boulter  
Brown (CO)  
Bruce  
Buechner

## NAYS—147

Bunning  
Burton  
Byron  
Carper  
Cheney  
Coats  
Coble  
Combest  
Craig  
Daub  
Davis (IL)  
DeLay  
DeWine  
Dorgan (ND)  
Dorman (CA)  
Dowdy  
Dreier  
Durbun  
Dyson  
Emerson  
English  
Erdreich  
Fields  
Flippo



Gallely	Mack	Skeen
Gekas	Madigan	Skelton
Gingrich	Marlenee	Smith (NE)
Glickman	Martin (IL)	Smith (TX)
Gonzalez	Martin (NY)	Smith, Denny
Grandy	McCandless	(OR)
Grant	McEwen	Smith, Robert
Gregg	Michel	(NH)
Gunderson	Molinari	Smith, Robert
Hall (TX)	Montgomery	(OR)
Hammerschmidt	Moorhead	Snowe
Hansen	Myers	Solomon
Harris	Natcher	Spence
Hastert	Nielson	Stangeland
Hayes (LA)	Packard	Stenholm
Hefley	Parris	Stump
Henry	Pashayan	Sundquist
Henger	Penny	Sweeney
Holloway	Perkins	Swindall
Hopkins	Petri	Tallon
Hunter	Pursell	Tauke
Inhofe	Quillen	Tauzin
Ireland	Ravenel	Taylor
Jacobs	Ray	Trafficant
Kolbe	Regula	Traxler
Konnyu	Rhodes	Upton
Kyl	Roberts	Volkmer
Leach (IA)	Robinson	Vucanovich
Lent	Roemer	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Watkins
Lewis (FL)	Roth	Weber
Lightfoot	Schaefer	Whittaker
Livingston	Schuetz	Wolf
Lott	Sensenbrenner	Wortley
Lowery (CA)	Shaw	Wyden
Lujan	Shumway	Wylie
Lukens, Donald	Shuster	Young (AK)
Lungren	Sisisky	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—17

Annunzio	Derrick	Jenkins
Brown (CA)	Edwards (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Bryant	Feighan	Morrison (CT)
Coleman (TX)	Gephardt	Ridge
Daniel	Huckaby	Rostenkowski
Dannemeyer	Hutto	

□ 1650

Messrs. ROBINSON, TRAXLER, TALLON, HALL of Texas, VOLKMER, TRAFICANT, SMITH of Texas, and DENNY SMITH changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. CHAPMAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1320, LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965 AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-35), on the resolution (H. Res. 135) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1320) to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April

1, 1987, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 2, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to make sure; the request is that we come in at 10 o'clock Thursday of this week, is that correct? Is that what the gentleman is asking for, 10 o'clock this week on Thursday?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct; the request is to come in at 10 a.m. on Thursday.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### REQUEST FOR PERMISSION ON TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1987, TO CONSIDER GENERAL DEBATE ON FIRST CONCURRENT ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT APRIL 6, 1987, TO FILE A REPORT ON FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the Committee on the Budget files a report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988 on or before Monday, April 6, 1987, that it be in order, section 305(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI to the contrary notwithstanding, on Tuesday, April 7, 1987, upon motion of the chairman of the Budget Committee or his designee to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider general debate only, with not to exceed 3 hours of general debate and not to exceed 1½ hours of debate as provided in section 305(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and that at the conclusion of said general debate the committee shall rise automatically without motion.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget have until midnight April 6, 1987, to file a report on the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I would like to inquire, the gentleman is asking for two unanimous-consent requests in one, is that correct?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I will be glad to separate them if the gentleman would request.

Mr. LOTT. I think it maybe will save a little time to go ahead and to do the two together.

I wonder, wanting to try to be cooperative, could we see the budget resolution before we go along with this kind of a unanimous-consent request, because we are waiving a couple of very important rules that give Members an opportunity to see what is in a budget resolution. We are waiving the 3-day rule and at least one other rule there that would cut off the Members' opportunity to see the budget resolution.

So if the gentleman could give us some information on when that budget resolution will be available, perhaps he could put this off and call it up, or could make his unanimous-consent request tomorrow, perhaps. But at this point, we just would be hesitant on this side to give unanimous consent to a request to waive these two very important rules not having even seen a budget resolution.

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I would advise the gentleman that the budget resolution has not yet been adopted by the Budget Committee, as the gentleman knows. Members of the Budget Committee have been seeking to discuss and deliberate on the question of the budget resolution, but have had some difficulty in carrying on that discussion and debate and markup within the committee. But the purpose here is to attempt to expedite the procedure under the Budget Act so that we could bring the budget resolution, particularly at least the general debate part of it, to the floor of the House next week.

Mr. LOTT. I understand the Budget Committee may be meeting, or maybe has met today or will be meeting tomorrow, and after they have had a chance to meet, perhaps we could see a budget resolution at that point, and we would be glad to discuss it further at that time.

But at this point, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION DAY

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 96) designating April 3, 1987, as "Interstate Commerce Commission Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. She is most gracious indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by asking are we designating April 1 the day to celebrate the Interstate Commerce Commission, or is it April 3? April 1 would, of course, be a much more appropriate day.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, this question is of such significance that the committee did deliberate in private about the significance of April 1 and the necessity to have this item brought up on April 1, but considering the urgency of the matter we changed our minds and brought it up today.

□ 1700

Mr. DINGELL. Is it possible to consider this matter, Mr. Speaker, on April 1, which is April Fool's Day? Is this resolution laudatory? Is it one of joy, or is it one of sorrow? I am trying to figure out what it is that goes on at that commission that we are celebrating.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DYMALLY. All of the above.

Mr. DINGELL. All of the above?

Mr. DYMALLY. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to be recognized under my own reservation of objection. I tell the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] that she has been most gracious to me, and I am quite content not to intrude into her time, but to proceed on my own reservation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object, but I would yield the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Would the gentleman like to make further comments?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, I thank the gentlewoman. She is most gracious. I have a certain reluctance to intrude upon her time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of thoughts I would like to share with my colleagues about the ICC. It once was a great organization. It once served the public interest. It once did things to protect the people of the United States against monopoly. It

once saw to it that there was competition. It once met, regularly. It once kept public records. It once did things deserving of the citizens' respect; and there was a time when a resolution of this sort was highly appropriate.

It must be observed that although the Commission now meets, it cannot show that it has accomplished anything. It appears before our committee from time to time to explain how it contrives to collect rather generous salaries for doing precisely nothing.

On matters relative to competition with regard to railroads and competitive shippers, I have a number of thoughts I would like to share with the House on this curious institution called the ICC.

I really do not want to impose upon the gentlewoman from Maryland, who has been most gracious.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman, because she has been abundantly gracious to me. On my reservation, if she has any desire to say anything either for or against this quaint institution, the ICC, I would be delighted to have her have her thoughts on the record, because I am sure they do have merit.

Mrs. MORELLA. I appreciate the gentleman's compliments.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it must be observed that the salaries and expenses that are collected by this agency are largely collected under false pretenses. The problems that the ICC might most noteworthy bring to the attention of the Congress, if it were to report fairly upon its action or upon its inaction, are that it has forgotten its responsibilities to the American people.

The ICC has failed to carry out the intent of the Staggers Rail Act, it has failed to protect captive shippers, to enhance competition, and to apply fairly the laws with respect to rail labor. It has disregarded the concerns of coal-producing areas and electrical utilities. It has disregarded the concerns of consumers of electric power and others who are dependent upon it to assure fair treatment.

It has recently even been incapable of telling that a major railroad failure impended until 2 weeks before the event occurred.

Mr. Speaker, shippers pleading their cases before the ICC have had to wait years before their cases have been processed. Usually the law will change several times during the processing because of the sloth, inaction, indifference, laziness, and slowness of the process before the ICC.

The ICC might establish as its motto that "justice delayed is justice denied," because it can be observed that in almost every instance the ICC has failed to process matters before it in proper speed.

Now I will observe to you that that curious, quaint, obsolete and indifferent institution has appeared before our committee, and the only evidence of diligence which we ascertain on their part is that they defend both their incompetence, their sloth, their indifference, and laziness.

I must say that the Commission has rarely found for the shippers, and rarely done anything to enhance competition. I will observe that we might say that this agency has perhaps made its greatest contribution in permitting the wholesale abandonment or sale of thousands of miles of track throughout the country without making any provision for protection of shippers, workers or communities.

It is regretful, at least, Mr. Speaker, that we are not considering this resolution on April 1, instead of the day before, because certainly if there is a congregation that deserves to have its affairs and its activities celebrated on April Fool's Day, it is the ICC. I say with even more profound regret that it is a great shame that we are honoring them on any day other than April Fool's Day, when they should be called to appear before this Congress with appropriate dunce caps and other proper arraignment to explain their inaction, their indifference, and their lack of concern for the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the chairman's comments, and I would like to associate myself with them.

The President of the United States, as part of his competitiveness package, has submitted or is in the process of submitting a bill to essentially abolish the ICC and transfer its consumer protection functions over to the Federal Trade Commission; and basically let the market determine who can compete in the trucking area, for example, and really in the acknowledgement of much of what you have been saying, would the gentleman be interested in possibly supporting that sort of initiative?

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman. I would observe, Mr. Speaker, that the ICC has effectively abolished the agency by being nonfunctional, but they have done it in all particulars save one: They show up regularly to collect their salaries.

I yield again to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in fact the White House and a number of people interested in this issue are moving in this area.



Maybe that would be a more appropriate subject for debate than this one.

Mr. DINGELL. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this legislation. I will simply observe that its passage means both the Congress, the ICC, the consumers of the country and the principles for which the ICC was founded.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against it, but it is sponsored by a dear friend of mine, to whom I wish to give no offense, and the chairman of the committee which has reported it happens to be one of my dearest friends, and I regret that more appropriate denunciations of this agency and more appropriate stimuli to it to behave properly in the public interest are not possible.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission will be 100 years old on April 5, 1987. The event will be celebrated on Friday, April 3, 1987.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, I wish to extend recognition and gratitude to the many men and women who have worked at the Commission administering the Nation's regulatory laws in the field of surface transportation.

It is only appropriate that we note this centennial event. I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the House to support passage of Senate Joint Resolution 96.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, April 5, 1987, is the 100th anniversary of the effective date of the act to regulate commerce.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, created to administer that act and subsequently enacted regulatory acts, is celebrating its centennial celebration on April 3, 1987.

For 100 years, the Commission has been responsible for administering the laws which regulate the surface transportation industries in this Nation.

Senate Joint Resolution 96 honors the Commission's efforts for the last 100 years, and all of the people who have worked to make our transportation system the envy of the world.

I urge my House colleagues to support the resolution.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 96

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission was created by Congress in 1887 to implement the congressional mandate to regulate interstate transportation, and 1987 marks the one hundredth year of its continuous public service;

Whereas the Commission was the first independent, quasi-judicial, administrative agency created by Congress as a pioneering concept in a growing Nation's legal system with a leading role in the development of an increasingly important body of administrative law;

Whereas the one-hundred-year period of the Commission's regulatory responsibility has embraced the challenge of two world wars and other major international conflicts, as well as continuous fluctuations in the Nation's economy and business cycles which span the Great Depression, postwar booms, and the beginnings of the nuclear and space ages;

Whereas the Commission's record of national service has encompassed tremendous changes in technology and competition accompanying the development and growth of waterways, railroads, pipelines, motor carriers, and air carriers;

Whereas the Commission has steadfastly endeavored to guard and protect the public interest in the development and regulation of the Nation's transportation system; and

Whereas, under its one hundred years of regulatory oversight dedicated to the development, promotion, and preservation of a national system of transportation under a free enterprise economy, a transportation system unsurpassed throughout the world has been established: Now, therefore, be it;

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 3, 1987, is designated as "Interstate Commerce Commission Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to recognize the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission.*

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL FORMER POW RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) to designate "National Former POW Recognition Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would like to inform the House that the minority has no objections to the legislation now being considered.

□ 1710

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPELEGATE].

Mr. APPELEGATE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my utmost thanks and appreciation to my colleague, MERVYN DYMALLY of California, in agreeing to bring this important resolution before the Chamber this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 47, passed by the Senate last Tuesday, is similar to my resolution, House Joint Resolution 155, which I introduced in the House on February 24. In little more than 1 month, over 120 House Members have agreed to co-sponsor this resolution which would designate April 9, 1987, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

Let me just say that I am highly pleased that the Senate acted with such diligence in adopting Senate Joint Resolution 47, introduced by the very able chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, Senator ALAN CRANSTON of California. Not only has the support for my resolution been very strong in the House, but the Senate Joint Resolution had 65 co-sponsors when it was passed on March 24, clearly indicating the support for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remark that Senate Joint Resolution 47 was amended on the floor of the Senate by including the word "former" into the title and the body of the resolution. This is a change we sought in order to distinguish our resolution from another resolution, House Joint Resolution 100, which seeks to establish September 18, 1987, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day.

While House Joint Resolution 100 deals with the very important matter of missing American servicemen in Southeast Asia following the war in Vietnam—and everyone in both Chambers holds a very strong interest in this issue of highest national priority—we felt it appropriate to take some time to recognize the approximately 80,000 former prisoners of war throughout our Nation today and pay tribute to them upon the 45th anniversary of that day when American soldiers holding out on the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines surrendered to enemy forces, eventually leading to the infamous Bataan "death march" and the deaths of thousands of Americans.

The experiences of former prisoners of war is something that, I'm sure, most Americans can hardly imagine. The brutality and hardship endured by Americans in captivity in World War II, the Korean war, and the war in Vietnam, is widely known. I feel

that all Americans who owe their freedom and liberty to the sacrifices that were made by all servicemen, and especially POW's, should reserve some time on April 9 to think of all the former prisoners of wars in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to the members of the American Ex-Prisoners of War who sought the passage of this resolution: national commander Curtis Musten; senior vice commander Albert Bland; national director-at-large Charles Williams; and, Dr. Charles Prigmore, national director of legislation.

Most of all, I want to thank my good friend and colleague from Ohio, the vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, Bob McEwen, for his unyielding support and assistance in making "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day" a reality. I want to thank him and everyone who joined in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 155.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage by the House of Senate Joint Resolution 47.

Mrs. MORELLA. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 47, designating April 9, 1987, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day" and I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his sponsorship of the resolution.

No single group of individuals in this country is more deserving of the gratitude of all Americans. As the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I would like to pledge the continued support of the Veterans Affairs Committee to work to see that they continue to receive the recognition and compensation they rightfully deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the date of April 9 was not a random selection—as thousands of our former prisoners of war well know. Many of them remember it as the day they were taken prisoner in the fall of Bataan during World War II.

It was President Eisenhower who said, "A soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chain." There are over 80,000 Americans living today who well remember both the weight of a soldier's pack and the burden of a prisoner's chains.

Our former prisoners of war faced their circumstances with honor and dignity—and they did so to secure the freedoms which are the hallmark of America.

I respectfully request all Members to join in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 47.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 47 designating April 9, 1987, as "National Former POW Recognition Day."

POW's are perhaps the most deserving heroes America has today and I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues in both the House and Senate who supported the legislation. This legislation shows a deep concern and a concerted effort by the Members of both Houses and the American people to honor our former prisoners of war. By establishing April 9, 1987, as a day of recognition for these brave men and women, we are proclaiming our deep gratitude and respect for their brutal and inhumane treatment and for the sacrifices they made to further our democracy.

The men and women who served their country in the frontlines of battle or in dangerous enemy territory were the first to be killed or taken captive. Our Nation owes these men and women and their families the profoundest statement of recognition for the losses they experienced at the hands of their captors. The ordeals of the POW's certainly did not end with the wars in which they fought. The after effects of starvation, torture, and disease linger today in their bodies and minds.

Therefore, I feel it is imperative that this body act favorably in proclaiming April 9, 1987, a day of recognition for the men and women who gave so much for the sake of their Nation. Let us honor these men and women and assure them that their sacrifices for the American people has not been forgotten.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. McEwen. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the House companion bill, House Joint Resolution 155, with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, DOUG APPELEGATE, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 47. This resolution seeks to honor all former American prisoners of war on April 9 of this year.

DOUG APPELEGATE is the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, and as the vice chairman of that subcommittee, we understand the many sacrifices and hardships these brave Americans have endured as prisoners of war. April 9 commemorates the 45th anniversary of the fall of Bataan in the Philippines during World War II in which several thousand Americans were taken prisoner. Tragically, some 30,000 Americans were taken prisoner in the Pacific Theatre. The mortality rate of these POW's was almost 40 percent.

This resolution honors all Americans of all wars who were captured. Moreover, it recognizes the great sacrifices and torment which they experienced at the hands of their captors. And it is a poignant reminder that their families endured the agony of not knowing the fate of their loved ones, the not knowing if their husband or a brother or a friend would come back home alive and in one piece.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution cannot fully reward or express our gratitude to these special Americans. But it is an expression of thanks to them and to their families on behalf of a grateful Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 47, which would set aside a special day of recognition for our former prisoners of war.

I also want to commend my distinguished colleagues from Ohio, Mr. APPELEGATE and Mr. McEwen, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, for introducing identical legislation in the House and for their active and outspoken advocacy of issues of special importance to former prisoners of war.

In hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee last year, one witness had this to say about the prisoner of war experience:

We have all heard stories about the inhuman, sadistic, and barbaric treatment dispensed by our enemy captors. We have all read of the death marches, starvation, beatings, torture and countless other atrocities suffered by these brave men (and I might add, brave women). But can we ever feel the physical and mental pain? Can we ever truly understand the complexity and the long-term effects of that pain as experienced by prisoners of war? We can only attempt to right these wrongs by continuing to pass legislation designed to expedite the continuing process of healing the wounds.

Mr. Speaker, this process of healing is carried out through both tangible benefits and services such as those offered by the Veterans Administration and through the type of recognition that is called for under the legislation we now consider. For the extraordinary courage and patriotism exhibited by our former prisoners of war, this measure is both appropriate and warranted.

I urge each of my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 47.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 47 designating April 9, 1987, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day."

This resolution recognizes the over 80,000 former prisoners of war living in this country and authorizes the President to give them the tribute they so justly deserve.

In each of America's wars, our prisoners of war have suffered extraordinary hardships but overcome them through bravery and sacrifice.

I also wish to pay tribute to the families of America's prisoners of war who suffered while awaiting news of their loved ones. The sacrifices these prisoners and their families made to help preserve the freedom of all Americans, must never be forgotten.

America's former prisoners of war symbolize the strength and patriotism of all Americans. The courage, suffering and profound devotion to duty of our former POW's have earned them the highest degree of gratitude our country can bestow.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 47.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.



The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 47

Whereas the United States has fought in many wars;

Whereas thousands of Americans who served in such wars were captured by the enemy;

Whereas many American prisoners of war were subjected to brutal and inhumane treatment by their enemy captors in violation of international codes and customs for the treatment of prisoners of war, and many such prisoners of war died or were disabled as a result of such treatment; and

Whereas the great sacrifices of American prisoners of war and their families are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it;

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 9, 1987, shall be designated as "National Former POW Recognition Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate such day with appropriate activities.*

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE MONTH

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 74) to designate the month of May, 1987 as "National Cancer Institute Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objections to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] who is the chief sponsor of the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 54.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues for joining me in supporting the passage of a bill which honors the 50th anniversary of the National Cancer Institute by designating the month of May as National Cancer Institute Month.

Mr. Speaker, having lost my beloved wife to this monster cancer in 1979, you can understand the depth of my feelings, that all possible efforts should be added to the research program of this country to try to find the cause and cure of that dread disease.

Fifty years ago, it was my great pleasure to sponsor a bill establishing the National Cancer Institute, and now, 50 years later, it pleases me to commemorate the 50th anniversary and the achievements made by this great Institute.

The progress made in cancer research, and the benefits in terms of the health of the people of our Nation and around the world, are simply incalculable. The National Cancer Institute's research programs have indicated that through systematic therapies, largely developed through clinical trials, more than 50 percent of all cancer patients are potentially curable, and numerous cancers now have 5-year survival rates of over 75 percent, in diseases such as thyroid endometrium melanoma, breast, bladder, Hodgkin's disease, and prostate cancer. Also, children's 5-year cancer survival rates are climbing to an all-time high of 60 percent.

Cancer research programs have contributed enormously to the development of biomedical knowledge, affecting not only cancer research but all other disease research. There now exists a network of 59 cancer centers across the country which provide the Nation with an invaluable national resource for cancer research, treatment, control, prevention, and training.

A network has been established across the Nation that links basic science laboratories, cancer centers, community cancer centers, cooperative groups of clinical researchers, community oncologists, practicing physicians, and nurse oncologists. This network also facilitates the application of the results of research.

Also, the National Cancer Institute has mounted a major program of research on cancer prevention, which serves as the basis for a prevention awareness program in our Nation. This program informs individuals of actions they can take to lower personal cancer risks—modifying diet and stopping smoking, for example.

It is expected that this resolution and the subsequent presidential proclamation will be helpful in calling to the attention of the American people the great research advances that have been made at the National Cancer Institute, the NCI-support cancer centers, and by the hardworking researchers. Also, this resolution will promote and inform the public about the opportunities for prevention of cancer, early detection of cancer, and the improved patient care as a result of the research advances that have occurred.

The National Cancer Institute is one most worthy of special recognition. I thank my colleagues for joining with me in recognizing the great contributions the Institute has made to the people of our Nation and around the world.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 74

Whereas in 1937 the "National Cancer Institute" was created by law,

Whereas the intent of Congress in enacting legislation in 1937 was to initiate a new, high priority, highly visible, national program for the conquest of cancer,

Whereas Congress continues to stress the importance of the National Cancer Institute through the creation of the 1971 National Cancer Act and its 1974, 1978, 1982, and 1986 reauthorizations,

Whereas the National Cancer Institute represents a unique structure for a coherent and systematic attack on the vastly complex problems of cancer through the National Cancer Institute,

Whereas the National Cancer Institute created a network of cancer centers that has increased from three before 1971 to fifty-nine in 1986, thus providing the Nation with an invaluable national resource for cancer research, treatment, control, prevention, and training,

Whereas recombinant DNA techniques and monoclonal antibody technologies have contributed so much to discovering the blueprint of cancer and now hold enormous promise for rapidly diagnosing and characterizing tumors and for treating patients,

Whereas cancer research scientists supported by the National Cancer Program funded by the National Cancer Institute determined the function of a normal human oncogene, and are elucidating the role of oncogene products in cancer, discovered the structure of the T-cell receptor, demonstrated the role of viruses in the causation of cancer, discovered that the virus HTLV-III is the cause of AIDS, showing that fundamental research in cancer biology forms the underpinnings for all other cancer research programs,

Whereas it has been shown that systemic therapies, largely developed through clinical trials, can cure cancer with more than 50 per centum of patients potentially curable and numerous cancers now have five-year survival rates over 75 per centum such as thyroid, endometrium, melanoma, breast, bladder, Hodgkin's disease, and prostate and with children's five-year cancer survival rates reaching an all-time high of 60 per centum,

Whereas progress continues in understanding and planning strategies to interfere with cancer metastasis and overcome drug resistance,

Whereas collaboration between surgery, radiation, therapy, chemotherapy, and therapy with biological response modifiers has greatly improved the outcome for cancer patients, allowing for less radical surgery by utilizing adjuvant radiation and new success in hard-to-treat tumors through improved chemotherapy,

Whereas the National Cancer Institute has mounted a major program of research on cancer prevention which serves as the basis for a prevention awareness program stressing what individuals can do to lower personal cancer risk by modifying lifestyle factors such as diet, and

Whereas the National Cancer Act has fostered the transfer of information from basic research to the patients' bedside, while strengthening a network that links basic science laboratories, cancer centers, cooperative groups of clinical researchers, community oncologists, practicing physicians, and nurse oncologists, and facilitate the application of the results of research: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the month of May, 1987 is designated as "National Cancer Institute Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and all appropriate Government agencies to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to designate May 1987 as Older Americans Month and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM], the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 173, designating May 1987 as Older Americans Month.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise certainly in support of Senate Joint Resolution 64. It is an identical version of my bill, House Joint Resolution 173, which has over 226 cosponsors in the House. I want to thank my colleagues for joining in this resolution again this year. This is the fifth year, consecutively, that I have had the privilege of sponsoring this resolution designating May as Older Americans Month and I think that it is a tribute to our senior citizens that we continually have so much strong support in the House and the Senate for this particular designation. It means a lot to the senior citizens to have a month set aside that we can have celebrations of their contributions to society and to all of the betterment that we all work for and that they have spent so much of their lives working for.

Let us not forget that our senior Americans are our country's most vital reservoir of knowledge and experience providing positive models to our youth.

This measure calls on the President to make the official designation and asks citizens to plan special activities to commemorate the month long observance. It is a great honor to be a part of this observance which means so much to our senior Americans. I hope all of my colleagues will support Senate Joint Resolution 64 and designate once again the month of May as Older Americans Month.

I thank the lady very much and I yield back to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

□ 1720

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 64, designating May 1987 as "Older Americans Month."

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the companion bill (H.J. Res. 173), introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM].

The contributions to our society by our Nation's seniors are innumerable, of paramount importance to us all and deserving of this expression of our Nation's gratitude. We must recognize this important group of Americans by designating the month of May as "Older Americans Month."

Our Nation's seniors have many needs, that unfortunately we have not always met. I hope that this designation in May 1987, will bring attention to all of our older Americans, so that we can help to assure to them the security needed to assist them through their senior years.

In the next few months the U.S. Congress will be focusing on several issues that will affect our older Americans. Issues such as catastrophic health insurance, the Social Security notch years, and safe, affordable housing are just a few of the many needs we must look at carefully. It is important that we realize their significance in the overall long-term plan to ease the financial and emotional burdens placed on this special group.

Having sponsored and cosponsored legislation in the past to protect our Nation's elderly, and I will continue to do so until they receive all of the benefits and care they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a great debt to these fine Americans for all that they have done to make this country as great as it is, and for all that they will continue to do, to make sure it stays that way. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 64, designating May 1987 as

Older Americans Month, and urge their continued work to assume the security and happiness of all of our older Americans.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish in the warmest way to commend the excellent remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 173, a bill introduced by my good friend from Florida, Hon. BILL McCOLLUM, to designate May 1987 as Older Americans Month. This meaningful measure recognizes the immensely important, valuable and growing role of older Americans in our society.

Today one of every eight Americans is over the age of 65. By the year 2030 greater than one in five of Americans will be over the age of 65. The older Americans are healthier and living longer than in years past. Today, the fastest growing segment of our population is Americans 85 years of age and older. I am proud to count myself as part of that group of Americans. Therefore, in numbers alone, older Americans represent a tremendous and vital force in American society.

Older Americans' efforts made and are continuing to help make our's the greatest nation in the world. It is critical that we take the opportunity of Older Americans Month to pay tribute to this role. It is also vitally important that we take this important opportunity to highlight what we in the Nation and in Congress need to do to ensure that older Americans can continue their important role and meet their many and growing needs, from health care to income security.

Perhaps there is no greater pressing need of older Americans than the assurance of access to affordable high quality health care. This year, the average American, age 65 and older, will spend over \$1,800, or roughly one-fifth of their income, paying for the health care they need. This is more than they were paying before the enactment of Medicare in 1965?

This year some 700,000 older Americans will be forced into poverty as a result of catastrophic illnesses such as stroke, Alzheimer's disease, cancer and Parkinson's because they require long-term care which is not covered by Medicare or private insurance. We need to enact a plan whereby older Americans can insure themselves against these catastrophic costs. I have legislation, H.R. 65, which provides comprehensive catastrophic health care protection to all elderly and disabled Americans. We must use the wide bipartisan agreement that exists to enact a meaningful catastrophic health plan for the elderly,



one that addresses the true health care catastrophe for older Americans—long-term care.

Seniors in this great Nation have so much to offer. With the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act last session, Congress has eliminated mandatory retirement for workers who are still fit and able to fulfill their responsibilities. It is so very important for people of all ages to be able to do perform whatever tasks make them happy and content in their life. The freedom to keep working and being able to provide for yourself and your family members should have no age limitations.

Income security has yet to be afforded to all other Americans. In fact, some 3.5 million of our Nation's elderly are living in poverty today. Four in 10 older Americans today are near poor and are at perilous risk of being in poverty in the future. We must strengthen, not weaken, programs designed to provide the elderly with a reasonable income level. We must also remove disincentives for older Americans to provide for themselves. I was very proud to have sponsored legislation which was enacted last year outlawing forced retirement of private sector workers age 70 and older. We must be diligent in assuring that this and other measures are strongly enforced.

There are many other pressing areas of need among older Americans—the fight against elder abuse and neglect, the protection of nursing home residents, provision of adequate transportation, just to name a few—which deserve our prompt attention.

I again warmly commend my friend and colleague from the great State of Florida, Mr. McCOLLUM, for sponsoring this important measure and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 64, and its counterpart, House Joint Resolution 174, designating the month of May 1987, as Older Americans Month.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Aging I feel it is fitting that we designate a month in which we call upon the American people to recognize the contributions of our older Americans. Approximately 12 percent of our Nation today are older Americans who continue to be productive members of our society. Older Americans continue to share their expertise and energies by working and volunteering in their local communities to assist others who are less fortunate. Our older Americans possess a wealth of knowledge and experience that should not be allowed to go idle. They are a diverse group of individuals who want to be productive and they continue to be a valuable and integral part of our society.

Our older Americans have made our Nation what it is today and in many ways that are shaping our future. By designating the month of May as older Americans month it will give us an opportunity to recognize and honor our older persons for their determination to mold and defend our Democratic values, their strong work ethic to revive our economy and their continued contribution to our nations well-being.

Mr. Speaker, we can all learn from the accomplishments of our older Americans, not only from their past efforts but their present efforts as well.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring our older citizens by supporting this resolution and I also call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act which is to be considered in late May.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Maryland and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM], the original author of this resolution, which is a very significant resolution.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I fully support designating May 1987 as "Older Americans Month." It is important that all of us keep a perspective on aging and designating May as "Older Americans Month" helps to call attention to a most valuable resource: senior citizens.

As the proportion of the elderly population continues to increase, Congress should enhance and not diminish the programs for our Nation's elderly. Through federally administered programs, through State administered programs and through the workable, productive arrangement of combination private and Federal management, Montana senior citizens have formed a partnership with government and are able to make important contributions to society.

The Older Americans Act, with its seven major titles, is a proven success story in Montana. Green Thumb, Meals on Wheels, senior transportation programs, senior citizen center funding, provisions of the Older Americans Act read like a Hall of Fame for Seniors programs. Also, Social Security is an example of a responsible, flexible government program that has endured to continue to meet the needs of seniors. Both of these are administered on a partnership between the government and citizens.

Government can meet the challenges of seniors programs, and Congress has so far been successful in creating new and innovative answers to the challenges facing America and the elderly. We must continue to do so.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 64

Whereas older Americans have contributed many years of service to their families, their communities, and the Nation;

Whereas the population of the United States is comprised of a large percentage of older Americans representing a wealth of knowledge and experience;

Whereas older Americans should be acknowledged for the contributions they continue to make to their communities and the Nation; and

Whereas many States and communities acknowledge older Americans during the month of May; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in recognition of the traditional designation of the month of May as "Older Americans Month" and the repeated expression by the Congress of its appreciation and respect for the achievements of older Americans and its desire that these Americans continue to play an active role in the life of the Nation, the President is directed to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1987, as "Older Americans Month", and calling on the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL FISHING WEEK

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating June 1 through June 7, 1987 as "National Fishing Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I am endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 18, which is similar to House Joint Resolution 121 that I previously introduced in the House, requesting that the President proclaim June 1-7, 1987, as "National Fishing Week."

Sport fishing is a time-honored and respected activity. In addition to providing protein-rich food, fishing has been a mainstay of American culture. Millions of people today enjoy the mental and physical benefits of fishing, following in the footsteps of native Americans and our early pioneers. A recent Gallup poll determined that fishing is the second most popular national activity of Americans. In fact, fishing

is the favorite active sport of almost 60 million Americans.

Sport fishing contributes in many ways to the health and well-being of our nation. Not only do fishermen benefit from being in the great American outdoors, nonfishermen benefit from the economic activity generated by the sport fishing industry. Last year, the sport fishing industry contributed over \$25 billion, and 800,000 jobs to our national economy.

During the last several years, Congress and the President have recognized the contributions of sport fishermen to our society by proclaiming a National Fishing Week. Across the country last year, people of all ages went to fishing clinics, competed in fishing tournaments, and participated in environmental seminars. The topics at the fishing clinics and seminars ranged from catching and cooking various species of fish, to game fishing laws and ethics.

The National Wildlife Federation, Optimists International, civic clubs, and various fishing gear manufacturers sponsored "take a kid" fishing activities. Through these and many other programs, thousands of children experienced the joys of fishing for the first time. In addition, many State Governors issued free fishing day proclamations, which provided an avenue for nonfishermen to try the sport, and to remind people who have not fished for a while of the joys of fishing.

National Fishing Week provides a wonderful opportunity for children, handicapped persons, and retired Americans and families to learn about our rich natural resources and the benefits of fishing. Children were encouraged to "get hooked on fishing—not on drugs." Everybody was urged to "take pride in America," and work to enhance our environment.

Again, I would like each of you to join me in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 18 and urging the President to set aside a week in June to recognize the pleasure, nourishment, and economic strength that fishing brings to our Nation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### S.J. Res. 18

Whereas the United States Bureau of the Census reported that fifty-four million residents of our country participated in sport fishing in 1980;

Whereas sport fishing is a family oriented, outdoor, recreational activity that provides therapeutic rewards and enjoyment to people of all ages;

Whereas the demands for goods and services by sport fishing participants is estimated to generate \$25,000,000,000 in economic activity and employment for an estimated six hundred thousand individuals in 1985;

Whereas the commercial fishing industry annually employs an estimated three hundred thousand individuals and lands over six billion pounds of seafood worth over \$2,400,000,000 in direct sales;

Whereas sport and commercial fishing provide an excellent source of healthful protein-rich food;

Whereas fishing promotes respect for our Nation's marine, estuarine, and fresh waters, and their associated plant and animal communities; and

Whereas our country's league of fishing enthusiasts represent a constituency that seeks to prevent the degradation of our Nation's diverse aquatic habitats: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is requested and authorized to issue a proclamation designating June 1 through June 7, 1987, as "National Fishing Week" and calling upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

#### INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION FOR A COMPETITIVE AMERICA ACT OF 1987

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, global interdependency is a fact of life. America can no longer exist in this world wearing linguistic blinders. The time is long overdue for us to recognize the need to enhance our awareness of the languages and cultures of other nations. As the 1979 President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies phrased it, "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security." It is today therefore my privilege to introduce the International Education for a Competitive America Act. This legislation expands on several existing foreign language and international education programs and creates innovative new ones. An identical bill was recently introduced in the Senate by Senator Dodd.

In today's highly competitive international economy, inferior language capabilities are handicapping our do-

mestic industries from the outset. Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Trade, Frank A. Weil has noted that our language deficiency is "one of the most subtle nontariff barriers to our export expansion." Our future national security and economic prosperity depend on our ability to communicate with our foreign counterparts. As technology shrinks the distances separating the nations of the world, we find ourselves dealing with foreign nationals with greater and greater frequency. Across the negotiating table, in our laboratories, through business deals, and in academic conferences we place ourselves at an immediate disadvantage by our limited ability to communicate. We must wake up and recognize that English is no longer the only game in town. One of the key themes, and tasks, for this Congress is restoring America's "competitiveness" in a highly complex, rapidly-changing world. Improving our foreign language training capability is a concrete and attainable goal in the context of international trade and our place in the world economy. It is a substantial way to give content to the "buzzword" of competitiveness.

Japan's remarkable recovery since the end of the war has been the greatest economic success story of the century, much to the chagrin of many of her competitors. The success can be attributed to a number of factors, but we cannot underestimate the importance of Japan's international marketing strategies, including especially its strong emphasis on other languages and cultures. The Japanese have deliberately prepared their businessmen and other professionals to operate in a global marketplace, with multicultural customers. They have learned the language, analyzed the needs, grasped the culture, and tried to understand the basic psyche of all potential consumers. It is estimated that there are 10,000 Japanese businesspersons who speak English in the United States, while less than 1,000 Japanese-speaking American businesspersons are in Japan.

U.S. companies, for the most part, have marketed their products abroad American-style. American advertising campaigns have not been as effective as they could be because we have not taken the time to understand international audiences. For example, in Italy advertisements for Schweppes tonic translated the product as "bathroom water." A Coca-Cola ad was phonetically translated into Chinese characters as "bite the wax tadpole." Not to be outdone, Pepsi's "Pepsi brings good things to life" translated into Chinese as "Pepsi brings your ancestors back from the dead." And Chevrolet marketing executives were stumped as to why their Nova car was not selling in



Spain until they finally realized that "Nova" translated into Spanish means "does not go." We have committed countless careless, thoughtless and costly mistakes which have done nothing for American prestige, let alone product sales. Americans are certainly not alone in making such errors, but especially considering our place in the world's economy and trade, we definitely need to significantly improve our foreign language capabilities.

The language of business must be the language of the customer. Yet, in only a small percentage of the Nation's business schools are courses in foreign languages or international affairs required. While 30 percent of American business profits are derived from trade and over 4,000,000 Americans travel abroad on business every year, the majority of American business persons have no training in foreign languages or international affairs. In fact, less than 1 percent of U.S. business schools have a foreign language requirement. We simply are not preparing these business majors for the future.

Likewise, our scientists and engineers are quickly finding that the latest breakthroughs in their fields are no longer occurring exclusively in English-speaking countries, or being reported only in English language journals. While other countries have access to most American technological advances through translation of journal articles or direct knowledge of English, Americans often do not have similar access simply because we lack the language capability. For example, less than 20 percent of Japanese technical journals are translated into English, while most Japanese scientists and engineers are able to read English or have access to translations of English into Japanese. This situation must change, or our leadership in science and technology in the world will also change, for the worse.

In short, studying foreign language and international affairs should no longer be limited to majors in those fields. Students themselves are beginning to realize that knowledge of certain key languages will make them more attractive to potential employers. Accordingly, enrollment in college-level Japanese courses increased 40.2 percent from 1980-83. This trend must be encouraged and expanded to encompass all languages of the world. Japan's is not the only market in which we will compete in the years ahead. Commerce in the Middle East, for example, will grow increasingly significant, to say nothing of its strategic value. Yet over that same 1980-83 period, the number of students studying Arabic actually declined by 0.9 percent.

We must improve the quality and scope of our foreign language and international training at all education-

al levels. Given that the ease of learning a second language is inversely proportional to age, it is discouraging to find that only 1 percent of students in our elementary schools receive any kind of foreign language training. Moreover, a 1982-83 survey showed that only 21.3 percent of all high school students were enrolled in foreign language courses, 88 percent of which were in Spanish and French. As for international knowledge, a recent survey found that 25 percent of high school students in Dallas could not name the country bordering us to the south, and in 1984, only 27 percent of students at a top State university knew that Manila is the capital of the Philippines. While this situation is changing, a large majority of our colleges and universities still do not designate minimal language skills as a requirement for either entrance into or graduation from their institutions.

The International Education for a Competitive America Act of 1987 addresses these deficiencies. The bill is designed to encourage the creation, development and expansion of foreign language programs at all levels; \$76 million would be authorized in assistance to States and higher education institutions to promote cultural and linguistic studies. Specifically, the bill would provide funding for:

Model foreign language programs on the elementary and secondary levels awarded to the States on a competitive basis;

Presidential Awards for Teaching Excellence in Foreign Languages to be given to 100 teachers each year;

Centers for international business education at several major American universities to coordinate foreign language and international education activities with business education;

A translation service for technical and scientific periodicals to correct our severe deficiencies in this crucial area; and

Restoring a portion of cuts in title VI foreign language and international programs that were mandated by the Higher Education Amendments of 1986.

This investment in our future national security is relatively minimal, yet the stakes are high. We must act now to put our foreign language and international education system back on track. I call on my colleagues to join me in demonstrating our support for a more internationally aware, linguistically sophisticated America.

The text of this resolution follows:

#### H.R. 1875

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "International Education for a Competitive America Act".

#### FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the future economic welfare of the United States will depend substantially on increasing international skills in the business and educational communities and creating an awareness among the American public of the internationalization of our economy; and

(2) significant improvement is necessary in the quantity and quality of foreign language and international studies instruction offered in the Nation's schools and institutions of higher education, and Federal funds should be increased to assist this purpose.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS ACT—

(1) The term "local educational agency" has the same meaning given that term under section 198(a)(10) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) The term "State educational agency" has the same meaning given that term under section 198(a)(17) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(4) The term "State" means any of the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

#### TITLE I—EDUCATION FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Education for Economic Security Amendments Act".

##### PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

SEC. 102. (a) Title IV of the Education for Economic Security Act is amended—

(1) by inserting before the section heading of section 401 the following:

"PART A—PRESIDENT AWARDS FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE"; and

(2) by adding after section 403 the following new part:

##### "PART B—PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR LANGUAGES

##### "PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS

"SEC. 411. (a) The President is authorized to make Presidential Awards for Teaching Excellence in Foreign Languages to elementary and secondary school teachers of foreign languages who have demonstrated outstanding teaching qualifications in the field of teaching foreign languages.

"(b) Each year the President is authorized to make one hundred and four awards under subsection (a) of this section. In selecting elementary and secondary school teachers for the award authorized by this section, the President shall select at least one elementary school teacher and one secondary school teacher from each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

##### "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 412. The President shall carry out the provisions of section 411, including the establishment of the selection procedures, after consultation with the Secretary of Education, other appropriate officials of Federal agencies, and representatives of professional foreign language teacher associations.

## "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"Sec. 413. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1988 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1989 through 1993 to carry out the provisions of section 411.

"(b) Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available for making awards under section 411, for administrative expenses, for necessary travel by teachers selected under section 411, and for special activities related to carrying out the provisions of section 411."

(b) The heading of title IV of the Act is amended to read as follows:

**"TITLE IV—PRESIDENTIAL AWARDS  
FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE"**

**TITLE II—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**SHORT TITLE**

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Foreign Language Education Assistance Act".

**PROGRAM AUTHORIZED**

SEC. 202. (a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall make grants to State educational agencies whose applications are approved under subsection (b) in order that such agencies may fund model programs, designed and operated by local educational agencies, providing for commencement or improvement and expansion of foreign language study for students residing within their school districts. Any State whose application is approved shall receive an amount equal to the sum of (1) \$275,000, plus (2) the product of \$0.06 multiplied by the population of the State (as determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census). The amount described in the preceding sentence shall be made available to the State for two additional years after the first fiscal year during which the State received a grant under this section if the Secretary determines that the funds made available to the State during the first year of funding were used in the manner required under the State's approved application.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—Any State educational agency desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of model programs designed by local educational agencies, and representing a variety of alternative and innovative approaches to foreign language instruction, which were selected school district of the local educational agency shall be eligible to participate in any model program funded under this section (without regard to whether such children attend schools operated by such agency);

(2) provides assurances that, if the application of the State educational agency is approved, each model program described in the application shall have available to it sufficient funds from State and local sources, in addition to any funds under this section, to ensure that the program is carried out as described in the application; and

(3) provides that the local educational agency will provide reliable and valid evaluations of pupils' proficiency at appropriate intervals in the program, and provide such evaluations to the State educational agency.

(c) **PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS.**—

(1) To the extent consistent with the

number of children in the State or in the school district of each local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such State or agency shall, after consultation with appropriate private school representatives, make provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate and which meet the requirements of this section. Expenditures for educational services and arrangements pursuant to this subsection for children in private schools shall be equal (taking into account the number of children to be served and the needs of such children) to expenditures for children enrolled in the public schools of the State or local educational agency.

(2) If by reason of any provision of law a State or local educational agency is prohibited from providing for the participation of children from private schools as required by paragraph (1), or if the Secretary determines that a State or local educational agency has substantially failed or is unwilling to provide for such participation on an equitable basis, the Secretary shall waive such requirements and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children which shall be subject to the requirements of this subsection. Such waivers shall be subject to consultation, withholding, notice, and judicial review requirements in accordance with section 557(b)(3) and (4) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

(d) **APPROPRIATIONS RULE.**—If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which State educational agencies may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

(e) **EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS.**—(1) From sums reserved for each fiscal year pursuant to section 205 to carry out the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies whose applications are approved under paragraph (3) in order that such agencies may support exemplary programs providing for commencing or improving and expanding foreign language study for students residing within their school districts.

(2) The Secretary may not approve any application for a grant under this subsection unless the Secretary determines that the exemplary program described in the application is consistent with the State programs approved under subsection (a) for the State in which the local educational agency is located.

(3) Each local educational agency desiring to receive a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing or accompanied by such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

**AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

SEC. 203. There are authorized to be appropriated \$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 through 1993 to carry out this title of which \$5,000,000 in each fiscal year shall be available to carry out subsection (e) of section 202.

**TITLE III—POSTSECONDARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION**

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Postsecondary Foreign Language and International Education Assistance Act".

**FOREIGN TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC PERIODICALS**

SEC. 302. (a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—(1) Section 607(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Act") is amended—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 610 and paragraph (1) of this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988 and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of subsection (d) of this section."

(2) Section 607(b) of the Act is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(1)".

(b) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—Section 607 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) From amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall provide for the acquisition, translation, and dissemination of technical and scientific periodicals published outside the United States. The Secretary shall disseminate translated periodicals acquired under this subsection directly or in coordination with the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, and other appropriate Federal agencies, to businesses, professional societies, libraries, and institutions of higher education.

"(2) In carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall select periodicals published outside the United States which the Secretary, after consultation with the Department of Commerce and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and with businesses and professional societies, determines may be of value to departments and agencies of the Federal Government, to businesses, and to researchers in the United States."

**ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR TITLE VI  
PART A**

SEC. 303. Section 610 of the Act is amended by striking out "and such sums as may be necessary for the 4 succeeding fiscal years." and inserting in lieu thereof "\$69,000,000 for fiscal year 1988, and such sums as may be necessary for the 3 succeeding fiscal years."

**CENTERS FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS  
EDUCATION AUTHORIZED**

SEC. 304. Title VI of the Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 612 and 613 as sections 613 and 614, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 611 the following new section:

**"CENTERS FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS  
EDUCATION**

"SEC. 612. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, to pay the Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing and operating centers for international business education which—

"(1) will be national resources for the teaching of improved business techniques, strategies, and methodologies which emphasize the international context in which business is transacted,

"(2) will provide instruction in critical foreign languages and international fields needed to provide understanding of the cul-



tures and customs of United States trading partners, and

"(3) will provide research and training in the international aspects of trade, commerce, and other fields of study.

In addition to providing training to students enrolled in the institution of higher education in which a center is located, such centers shall serve as regional resources to businesses proximately located by offering programs and providing research designed to meet the international training needs of such businesses.

"(b) Each grant made under this section may be used to pay the Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing or operating a center, including the cost of—

"(1) faculty and staff travel in foreign areas, regions, or countries,

"(2) teaching and research materials,

"(3) curriculum planning and development,

"(4) bringing visiting scholars and faculty to the center to teach or to conduct research, and

"(5) training and improvement of the staff, for the purpose of, and subject to such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary for, carrying out the objectives of this section.

"(c)(1) Programs and activities to be conducted by centers assisted under this section shall include—

"(A) interdisciplinary programs which incorporate foreign language and international studies training into business, finance, management, communications systems, and other professional curricula;

"(B) interdisciplinary programs which provide business, finance, management, communications systems, and other professional training for foreign language and international studies faculty and advanced degree candidates;

"(C) evening or summer programs, including, but not limited to, intensive language programs, available to members of the business community and other professionals which are designed to develop or enhance their international skills, awareness, and expertise;

"(D) collaborative programs, activities, or research involving other institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, professional associations, businesses, firms, or combinations thereof, to promote the development of international skills, awareness, and expertise among current and prospective members of the business community and other professionals;

"(E) research designed to strengthen and improve the international aspects of business and professional education and to promote integrated curricula; and

"(F) research designed to promote the international competitiveness of American businesses and firms, including those not currently active in international trade.

"(2) Programs and activities to be conducted by centers assisted under this section may include—

"(A) the establishment of overseas internship programs for students and faculty designed to provide training and experience in international business activities, except that no Federal funds provided under this section may be used to pay wages or stipends to any participant who is engaged in compensated employment as part of an internship program; and

"(B) other eligible activities prescribed by the Secretary.

"(d)(1) In order to be eligible for assistance under this section, an institution of

higher education, or combination of such institutions, shall establish a center advisory council which will conduct extensive planning prior to the establishment of a center concerning the scope of the center's activities and the design of its programs.

"(2) The Center Advisory Council shall include—

"(A) one representative of an administrative department or office of the institution of higher education;

"(B) one faculty representative of the business or management school or department of such institution;

"(C) one faculty representative of the international studies or foreign language school or department of such institution;

"(D) one faculty representative of another professional school or department of such institution, as appropriate;

"(E) one or more representative of local or regional businesses or firms;

"(F) one representative appointed by the Governor of the State in which the institution of higher education is located whose normal responsibilities include official oversight or involvement in State-sponsored trade-related activities or programs; and

"(G) such other individuals as the institution of higher education deems appropriate.

"(3) In addition to the initial planning activities required under section (d)(1), the center advisory council shall meet not less than once each year after the establishment of the center to assess and advise on the programs and activities conducted by the center.

"(e)(1) The Secretary shall make grants under this section for a minimum of three years unless the Secretary determines that the provision of grants of shorter duration is necessary to carry out the objectives of this section.

"(2) The Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing and operating centers under this section shall be—

"(A) not more than 90 per centum for the first year in which Federal funds are furnished,

"(B) not more than 70 per centum for the second such year, and

"(C) not more than 50 per centum for the third such year and for each such year thereafter.

"(3) The non-Federal share of the cost of planning, establishing, and operating centers under this section may be provided either in cash or in-kind assistance.

"(f)(1) Grants under this section shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out the objectives of this section. Such conditions shall include—

"(A) evidence that the institution of higher education, or combination of such institutions, will conduct extensive planning prior to the establishment of a center concerning the scope of the center's activities and the design of its programs in accordance with subsection (d)(1);

"(B) assurance of ongoing collaboration in the establishment and operation of the center by faculty of the business, management, foreign language, international studies and other professional schools or departments, as appropriate;

"(C) assurance that the education and training programs of the center will be open to students concentrating in each of these respective areas, as appropriate; and

"(D) assurance that the institution of higher education, or combination of such institutions, will use the assistance provided under this section to supplement and not to

supplant activities conducted by institutions of higher education described in subsection (c)(1)."

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 305. Section 614 of the Act (as redesignated by section 321 of this Act) is amended to read as follows:

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 614. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1988 and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years to carry out the provisions of section 612.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1987, and such sums as may be necessary for the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the provisions of section 613."

#### CONFORMING AMENDMENT

SEC. 306. Section 613 of the Act (as redesignated by section 321 of this Act) is amended by striking out "part" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section".

### THE INSURANCE INSOLVENCY THREAT

(Mr. FLORIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a development in the insurance industry with troubling implications for the entire country.

A New Jersey insurance company has been declared insolvent for the first time in nearly 12 years. An article from the Journal of Commerce states that the primary reason for the liquidation of Integrity Insurance Co. is the inability of an insolvent California insurer, Mission Insurance, to pay claims it owed Integrity.

This blow to the insurance industry in my State illustrates the threat to our entire economy from a rising number of insolvent insurers. Insurance companies reinsure each other and contribute to State guarantee funds which are supposed to protect policyholders in the event of insolvency.

These linkages mean, however, that the demise of one company can imperil others. The turmoil in the insurance industry associated with the crisis in the unaffordability of insurance threatens to overwhelm existing methods of preventing insolvencies and mitigating their consequences. The Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness will continue investigating this problem. Responsible officials must take action before more insurance companies join banks in a row of tumbling financial dominos, with grave consequences for our economy.

I am submitting the Journal of Commerce article for the RECORD, as follows:

# **N.J. DECLARES INTEGRITY \$50 MILLION INSOLVENT**

(By C.A. Carpenter)

Integrity Insurance Co. was declared at least \$50 million insolvent and placed under the control of New Jersey insurance regulators.

The Paramus, N.J., property and casualty insurer, thus becomes the first New Jersey insurer to be declared insolvent in almost 12 years, New Jersey Insurance Commissioner Kenneth D. Merin said. Integrity is a wholly owned subsidiary of Integrity Financial Group Inc.

The liquidation also follows a recent new wave of insolvencies for the insurance business around the country.

Constellation Reinsurance Co. of New York recently was placed under liquidation as at least \$28.7 million insolvent. Ambassador Insurance Co., based in North Bergen, N.J., but domiciled as a Vermont insurer, also has been ordered into liquidation with at least \$100 million of more liabilities than assets. And in the largest yet for history, Mission Insurance Cos., Los Angeles, have agreed to liquidation of its operations that have a negative net worth of \$448.1 million.

Mission's inability to pay claims is primarily why Integrity is being liquidated. And Integrity's insolvency has raised the ire of federal lawmakers now looking into some form of stricter federal control of the insurance business. The lawmakers are concerned that Mission's liquidation may ripple throughout the country.

In fact, even the insurance industry estimates that it carries some \$70 billion of reinsurance that it won't be able to collect on.

Integrity purchased reinsurance from Mission, and carried on its books at least \$25 million due from Mission. The company, however, hadn't set up a reserve in case the reinsurance proved uncollectible. Ironically, Integrity's operations have been improving; underwriting losses through the nine months last year narrowed to \$6.8 million from \$17 million in the same period for 1985. At the end of September, its surplus was \$12.5 million.

The company has been held under the control of the New Jersey insurance department since December when Superior Court Judge William C. Meehan signed an order placing the company in rehabilitation.

The New Jersey department asked the court to place the company in liquidation, arguing the firm is "hopelessly insolvent to the extent of at least \$50 million."

Integrity primarily wrote commercial liability and automobile insurance. It has about 2,000 policyholders in New Jersey and about 20,000 nationwide.

It is licensed in all 50 states and has assets of about \$130 million, according to the department.

The department said claims against Integrity arising in New Jersey for most property/casualty lines will be paid up to a limit of \$300,000 a claim by the New Jersey Property-Liability Insurance Guaranty Association.

□ 1730

## **THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1987**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman STENHOLM and I, together with some of our colleagues, have introduced the Civil Rights Act of 1987. Through this legislation, we offer a consensus-building bipartisan alternative on civil rights protection.

This bill reverses the Supreme Court's decision in *Grove City* versus Bell by covering education institutions and public school districts receiving any Federal assistance under all four cross-cutting civil rights statutes—section 504, title VI, title IX, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975. However, we avoid the controversial and hopelessly knotty task of expanding or narrowing all other applications of these statutes from their pre-*Grove City* scope.

Moreover, this bill seeks a commonsense civil rights policy by incorporating the Tauke-Sensenbrenner abortion-neutral amendment passed by the House Education and Labor Committee and religious tenets exemption language passed by Congress last fall in the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1986. As the vote in the House Education and Labor Committee demonstrated, addressing the issues of abortion neutrality and religious tenets enhances the probability of passage as well as forges a consensus.

It is especially appropriate that Congress pursue this consensus-building, commonsense approach on civil rights in 1987. This year, America celebrates the bicentennial of the Constitution. That document has been referred to as "The most remarkable work . . . to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, in its application to political affairs." It should be remembered that the Constitution was not one framer's proposal rubber-stamped by the Convention. Nor were the framers stampeded into adopting its provisions by one cluster of interest groups. The marvel of the Constitution is not just its ideals but that it reflected a hard-fought consensus of diverse and strong-willed individuals. Let us apply the lessons of the framing of the Constitution to carrying out its goals of civil rights. The major features of the Civil Rights Act of 1987 are products of the 3 year experience with the *Grove City* bill. In our constitutional tradition, I hope many of my colleagues join the bipartisan coalition to this civil rights bill that reflects experience, compromise, and consensus.

## **INTRODUCTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 307(C) OF CZMA: PRESERVING STATE REVIEW OF FEDERAL ACTIONS AFFECTING THE COASTAL ZONE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a landmark decision, the Supreme Court upheld the right of States to regulate federally permitted activities on Federal lands within their borders. In the case of *California Coastal Commission* versus *Granite Rock Co.*, the Court found that regulations imposed on mining by a Federal agency "not only are devoid of any expression of intent to preempt State law but

rather appear to assume that those submitting plans of operations will comply with State laws." The clear message of the Court is that the States have a legitimate interest in regulating activities on Federal land that have an effect on State land.

Unfortunately, recent judicial and administrative actions have eroded the application of this principle with regard to federally permitted activities on the Outer Continental Shelf [OCS]. Because of these actions, coastal States have had an increasingly difficult time asserting their interests in protecting air and water quality and traditional coastal industries from the adverse effects of Federal offshore activities. This difficulty arises from a serious misinterpretation of the consistency provision of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 [CZMA]—a provision which was originally intended by Congress to guarantee a meaningful role for the coastal States in regulating activities which directly affect coastal environments and economies.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would amend the CZMA to insure that Federal activities which directly affect the coastal zone are consistent with approved State coastal management plans.

Congress first enacted the consistency provision of CZMA in order to provide an incentive for coastal States to develop and implement coastal management programs. The consistency language assured coastal States that if they spent the time and money necessary to formulate such programs, they would not be preempted by conflicting or opposing Federal actions. A mutually beneficial and constructive partnership was thus established; the States agreed to abide by Federal criteria in developing their coastal programs, and the Federal Government agreed that activities which "directly affected" a State's coastal zone would be consistent, "to the maximum extent practicable," with that State's coastal protection efforts.

The plain language of the section strongly suggests that Congress intended section 307 to require that all Federal activities directly affecting the coastal zone—including those which occur outside the coastal zone—be consistent with an affected State's approved coastal management program. The text of the section requires that:

Each Federal agency conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the coastal zone shall conduct or support those activities in a manner which is, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with approved State management programs (16 U.S.C. 1456(C)(1)).

Yet in spite of the clear intention that consistency was to be required of any federally permitted activity significantly affecting the coastal zone regardless of location, the courts have found Outer Continental Shelf leasing, and exploration plans submitted subsequent to leasing, to be activities which occur outside the coastal zone and therefore outside the purview of the statute. In addition, the Departments of Interior, Commerce, and Justice have made a concerted effort to severely restrict the applications of the consistency review process. The Justice Department has filed briefs in support of the position that federally permitted activities must occur within



the coastal zone itself in order to be reviewed by coastal States for consistency.

This interpretation of the law is clearly contradicted by a review of the legislative history of the 1972 Act, and by legislative intent expressed in House reports on subsequent amendments to the act. In addition, this interpretation is contradicted by a 1981 vote by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—where the original act and 1976 and 1980 amendments originated—to veto proposed Commerce Department regulations restricting section 307(c)(1) to exclude Federal OCS leasing activities from consistency review.

But these most recent judicial and administrative interpretations do much more than obscure a clear understanding of congressional intent; they severely limit the right of coastal States to exercise limited influence over those Federal activities which directly affect the coastal zone. These actions raise the implication that all Federal activities on the OCS might be exempt from the consistency requirements of section 307(c)(1). Contrary to these court and administrative decisions, a Federal activity; that is, a lease sale or oil exploration, does not have to take place within the coastal zone to have a direct effect on it. The important issues is not the geographic location of the activity per se, but the nature of its subsequent impact on the coastal zone. Recent rulings and actions limit the interpretation of "direct impact on the coastal zone" to such an extent that the consistency provision is in danger of becoming meaningless with respect to any activity which does not take place within the coastal zone itself.

If the States are to have a meaningful voice in activities which clearly affect their coastal zones, regardless of the geographic location of those activities, the consistency provision must be clarified.

In order to insure States an opportunity to influence decisions which would affect their coastal zones, and in order to avoid future misinterpretation of the statute in this regard, I am introducing legislation clarifying section 307(c)(1). This legislation would amend section 307(c)(1) of CZMA to require that Federal activities—including those occurring landward or seaward of the coastal zone—which directly affect the coastal zone shall be subject to the section's consistency requirements. In addition, the legislation would—unlike current statute—provide a definition of activities directly affecting the coastal zone.

This legislation does not seek to extend the authority to require a consistency review provided by the original act. Rather, the bill seeks to insure that coastal States may continue to exercise only that authority which—but for recent judicial and administrative actions—would be legitimately claimed and exercised by coastal States as they have since CZMA's enactment in 1972. Consistent with this view, this amendment would not affect those Federal actions which occur outside the coastal zone and which do not directly affect the zone. Nor would this legislation provide to States an extension—de facto or otherwise—of veto authority over Federal activities affecting the coastal zone. Rather, it merely insures coastal States the right to object to Federal activities affecting the coastal zone.

Mr. Speaker, Congress long ago recognized the need for establishing a working partnership to ensure the orderly development and preservation of coastal resources in its enactment of the CZMA. Court decisions and Federal agency actions which have reinterpreted the CZMA seriously weaken one of the major bonds of this partnership: State review of Federal activities which directly affect the coastal zone. We must seek to restore the strength of this critical tie, and the State-Federal partnership which depends upon it.

The legislation I am introducing today would seek to stem the erosion of this partnership through reinterpretation of this important statute. The principle established by the Supreme Court in last week's decision in *California Coastal Commission versus Granite Rock*—that States have a legitimate interest in regulating activities on Federal land which have a direct impact on State land—should be reaffirmed and applied to offshore activities. It is clear that activities on the Federal OCS can and do have direct and significant impacts on coastal States. Consistency demands that the principle which applies onshore should apply offshore as well. I commend this legislation to my colleagues for their consideration, and urge their support.

#### H.R. 1876

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307(c)(1) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:*

"(c)(1)(A) Each Federal agency conducting or supporting an activity (whether within, or landward or seaward of, the coastal zone) that directly affects the coastal zone shall conduct or support that activity in a manner which is, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with approved State management programs.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), a Federal agency activity shall be treated as one 'that directly affects the coastal zone' if the conduct or support of the activity either—

"(i) produces identifiable physical, biological, social, or economic consequences in the coastal zone; or

"(ii) initiates a chain of events likely to result in any of such consequences.

"(C) As used in subparagraph (A), the phrase 'the maximum extent practicable,' shall be construed as requiring each Federal agency to conduct or support each of its activities directly affecting the coastal zone in a manner fully consistent with approved management programs, unless—

"(i) the conduct or support of the activity in that manner is prohibited by Federal law; or

"(ii) a circumstance arising after a management plan is approved, and unforeseen at the time of approval, presents a substantial obstacle to the achievement by the agency of full consistency in conducting or supporting the activity.

In the event that achievement by a Federal agency of full consistency is prevented by a circumstance described in clause (i) or (ii), the agency may deviate from full consistency only to the extent justified by the presence of such circumstance."

#### SOVIET JEWRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that this special order is taking place on the last day of the month of March 1987. In granting 450 emigration visas between the last day of February and today, the Soviets have taken their most positive step in years toward ameliorating their abysmal record on human rights. Their rhetoric in recent days, particularly in last week's meetings with Morris Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Edgar Bronfman, chairman of the World Jewish Congress, has given us hope that even greater deeds are ahead. But let us hope that this new spirit of openness, of glasnost, is not just an empty promise, a public relations gimmick.

Over 100 prisoners of conscience, both Jewish and non-Jewish, have been released from their cells. These include Soviet Jewish refusenik Iosif Berenshtein and Soviet Christian activist Aleksandr Ogorodnikov, on behalf of both of whom I have written to Secretary Gorbachev.

But many others still remain in prison, locked away for the crime of practicing their religion or for the offense of merely speaking in favor of the independence of regions enslaved by the Soviets after the world wars.

Four hundred and fifty visas in 1 month is indeed a great improvement over the rate for every year since 1981.

But while it is 10 times better than March 1986, when only 47 visas were granted, it is still only one-tenth as good as March 1979, when some 4,000 Soviets were given permission to leave for freer shores.

And we must not forget the standard of free emigration against which even the best of these figures must be judged. In 1948, the Soviets signed the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that, "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including their own." And in 1975 the U.S.S.R. signed the Helsinki accord, which declares that, "The participating states will deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the application of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family, with special attention being given to requests of an urgent character—such as requests submitted by persons who are ill or old."

Vladimir Slepak, a refusenik whose son is presently in the midst of a 17-day fast on the grounds of this building, has said to us, his friends in America, "If you turn your eyes, even for a moment, we will cease to exist." I share Mr. Slepak's suspicion that without a continued strong show of in-

terest by the West, the recent signs of improvement in Soviet human rights will disappear. That is why, now more than ever, it is crucial that we have events such as this to show the Soviets that we care.

That we care about Vladimir Slepak, still a refusenik after 17 years.

That we care about Sheina-Lea Swartz, an elderly woman who is dying of cancer yet is denied permission to come to the West for treatment.

That we care about those brave Balts, Ukrainians, and Kazakhs who are repressed for speaking out on behalf of their nation's freedom or jailed for attempting to keep alive their native languages and cultures.

That we care about all 400,000 Soviet Jews who wish to live in freedom but may not, about all those citizens of the Soviet Union who wish to exercise their inalienable rights but are stifled.

The U.S. Congress has a record in this regard of which I think it may justifiably be proud. Organizations such as the Human Rights Caucus, the Congressional Friends of Human Rights Monitors, and the Congressional Coalition for Soviet Jewry, on whose steering committee I am proud to be one of the two freshmen Representatives have done excellent work on behalf of human rights in the Soviet Union.

I have personally called Leningrad to offer my support to Lev Shapiro, who, in a typical twist of Soviet justice, was punished for keeping his daughter out of school after she was denied admission to school because her father was a refusenik.

I have personally heard across the miles the tearful voice of Sheina-Lea Swartz's daughter in Moscow, Rolla Shtein, and have spoken face to face at the Soviet Embassy with those who represent here the system which has kept ill Mrs. Swartz from treatment in America.

I know that many of my colleagues here with me now have had similar experiences, which have made even stronger their determination to press on with the fight for justice across the seas. I yield the floor to them now so that they may join me in making heard the voice of freedom.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to yield to the gentleman from New York, who has been patient enough to wait for me to finish. I know that the gentleman has a meeting that he wishes to attend.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, with each succeeding Congress, those of us involved in the fight for Soviet Jewry are pleased to welcome new Members to our ranks. Today's special order is at the behest of our new colleagues, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman

from Arizona [Mr. KYL]. I thank them for today's initiative and for this opportunity to speak out at this crucial time. It is only through such collective efforts that we will succeed. The staunch commitment of all of our colleagues to human rights is both needed and highly appreciated.

The situation facing Soviet Jews, for all the talk of glasnost, does not appear to have changed much lately. We are thankful to see the release of a number of prisoners of conscience, such as Iosef Begun and Vladimir Lifschitz, yet these men never committed any crime to begin with. They and others were arrested, charged, convicted and sentenced to horrendous prison and labor camp terms solely because they were Jewish. Has glasnost brought them their emigration permits? Not yet. Iosef Berenshtein, Yuli Edelshtein, and Alexei Magarik remain prisoners. Their health is precarious. Has glasnost reached these innocent men? Not yet. Thousands of Soviet Jews suffer harassment, discrimination, and loss of employment merely because they applied for permission to emigrate, a right guaranteed them by the Helsinki Final Act, to which the Soviets are a signatory. Yet new emigration regulations severely restrict even those who can apply. Is this glasnost? I think not.

Even if we were to recognize the new emigration regulations as a legitimate manifestation of international law, the Soviet Union does not comply. Ida Nudel has been waiting for years to join her sister in Israel. Vladimir and Maria Slepak have yearned to be reunited with their sons. And Mark Terlitsky received yet another refusal to reunite with his brother only a few short weeks after the new regulations took effect. These individuals have not seen glasnost applied to them.

Emigration rates from the Soviet Union continue to be extraordinary low. Only 914 persons last year were allowed to leave. Some have made much of the fact that this month, some 450 individuals have emigrated. However, this contrasts markedly with the reportedly 400,000 who desire to reunify with family members abroad. Is this glasnost? It doesn't seem to be.

Soviet officials continue to interfere with the free flow of mail and parcels to the Soviet Union, and on May 1, 1987, will implement a new customs regulation that will require package contents to be described in Russian or French only. English will no longer be acceptable, despite the fact that English is the international language. Is this glasnost? I doubt it greatly.

Mr. Speaker, the veneer of glasnost loses its sheen upon close inspection. If the Soviet Union truly desires improved relations with the United States, a truer commitment to human rights for Soviet Jews is required. Glasnost for Soviet Jews and other mi-

norities in the Soviet Union does not yet exist.

□ 1740

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlewoman for cosponsoring this special order and also to thank all of the others who have expressed a desire to join us here and who have already done so much on this matter.

This response makes a critical point about why we are here today. We know that the only way to gain concessions from the Soviets, including in the area of human rights and immigration is to keep the pressure on, to keep the spotlight of public opinion focused on their actions rather than succumbing to the siren song of their words.

This week the Soviets have announced minor increases in immigration levels. True, they are a great improvement, but that is only because they started from such a low level to begin with.

From the historical perspective of 4,000 Jewish immigrants per month, last month's great increase to 400, which is one-tenth of the earlier level, is clearly no more than cosmetic. The point is this: We only gain ground in the struggle for human rights by constantly pushing. We would not have seen the release of dissidents like Anatoly Schransky or the improved treatment of Andrei Sakharov or the immigration of 400 Jews last month without events like this. Where, in our free country we are allowed to assemble and to speak out and to gain publicity in our free press for the cause of freedom, and that is why we are here today.

We do not suppose for a moment that last month's immigration of Jewish immigrants presage a flood of immigration from the Soviet Union. Without events like this, I am sure most of us doubt that even a level of 400 could long be sustained.

But we must do more than merely speak out. We must also avoid actions that play into the hands of the Soviets and make it easier for them to deny rights while talking a good game. We must avoid being duped, being used by Soviet propagandists. I would like to briefly discuss one specific problem which I hope will add to our understanding this afternoon.

The subject to which I refer is an agreement entered into between the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers in May of 1985. It was subsequently replaced by another understanding in the summer of 1986. I would like to read to you the first line of this second declaration be-



tween the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers.

The first words are as follows: "Being mutually pledged to advance the rule of law in the world." That is how the document begins. Efforts to rescind this agreement have thus far been unsuccessful, but I am proud to say that two of my friends, Patience Huntwork and Orest Jeyna, both Phoenix lawyers, have worked hard to bring this matter to the delegates of the American Bar Association and to rescind the agreement that has been entered into.

The agreement, as I said, begins with the phrase that the lawyers of the Soviet Union and the United States are mutually pledged to advance the rule of law. The agreement is therefore naive and dangerous. I find it incredible that the American Bar Association, of which I am a member, could be a signatory to an agreement that makes such a naive statement to begin with.

The whole point of the rule of law is to protect human rights and the most basic of these rights we know are denied to the citizens of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not mutually pledged to advance the rule of law as we understand and cherish it. This is what makes this agreement so dangerous. The ABA's action falsely equates commitments to justice when there is no equivalent from the Soviets. It serves of the purpose of Soviet propagandists who attempt to create the impression that their system is like ours.

Finally, it is demoralizing to those Soviet citizens who are fighting and suffering for their fight for human rights who lose hope that the free world understands the depth of human abuses in the Soviet Union.

The danger in these actions is that the Soviets see that they can gain legitimacy without making meaningful actions. In fact, I believe that such agreements serve to act as a disincentive for the Soviets to seriously address human rights issues.

That this is the case I think we need to look no further than the ABA Steering Committee report to the house of delegates at their midyear meeting last month. They reported under a heading, "What Has Been Accomplished," that this agreement with the Soviets has resulted in announced regulations dealing with the immigration process. What they do not state is that this new Soviet immigration law has been roundly condemned by human rights groups. The Union of Councils for Soviet Jews states, and I am quoting, "Far from liberalizing and speeding up the process of immigration, the new decree ensnarls hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews in a bureaucratic maze of red tape, delays and puts their faith totally at the

mercy of the Soviet Immigration Office."

The level of mercy shown by Soviet immigration officials is best evidenced by the number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union in the last several years from a high of 51,000-plus in 1979 to a pitiful 914 last year.

The ABA report highlights the release of prominent Soviet dissidents. What needs to be highlighted is the fact that there are 400,000 Soviet Jews who have taken steps to immigrate and have not yet received permission. Let there be no doubt about the state of the refusenik: No job, no help, just isolation and repression.

Finally, the ABA concludes their report by seemingly apologizing for Soviet behavior by stating that "While the United States is over 200 years old, the Soviet Union is only 65 years old. And while the United States will celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Constitution, the Soviet experience with their current constitution is only 10 years old. Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect quick change from the Soviets." That the ABA could make such a sloppy analogy is very sad. The comparison is, on its face, absurd.

Our Government is based on the principles of democracy. Government by the people. The Soviet Government is a totalitarian government, which by definition, subordinates the individual to the state.

Coming from diametrically opposed political philosophies, it is ludicrous to suggest that 200 years of 2,000 years of experience with their constitution based on their philosophy, would result in any positive change.

Our Government, even for all of its faults, in 1787, provided greater rights than the Soviet Union does in 1987, 200 years later.

To attribute human rights abuses in the Communist state of the U.S.S.R. merely to a time factor rather than the brutal system imposed upon its hapless people is mush-headedness. Just how much progress has been made in 70 years? Is there a free press? There was in our Colonies 200 years ago. Is there free speech. There was in our Colonies 200 years ago. Free religious pursuit; that is why the people came to this continent in the first place. Freedom to emigrate from the beginning of this country.

□ 1750

No, it is not the passage of time, but the fundamental recognition that we are all created equal, with God-given inalienable rights that are protected by a Constitution that means something because lawyers and jurists as well as the media and all Americans believe that we are free. That is what makes a free society.

The Soviet Communist Government cannot accept those principles and sur-

vive. To believe that it is only a matter of time and our good influence before they will change is foolish, naive, dangerous, and a sad defeat for the thousands of Soviets who count on us for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close simply by quoting very briefly from some testimony given by Anatoly Shcharansky. I spoke with Anatoly Shcharansky about this agreement. I asked him what he thought about it and I am going to submit something for the RECORD that is a little bit longer that explains his position in full; but he said that there was nothing more dispiriting to the people in the Soviet Union, nothing that could make them lose more hope about their ultimate ability to gain freedom than to see Americans who ostensibly are there to help them being duped into agreements, such as this.

I would like to quote just briefly from his testimony given earlier this year which explains his personal experience with the rule of law in the Soviet Union, and I am now quoting from Anatoly Shcharansky's testimony. He said:

So, from this, my personal experience as well as from being familiar with other cases of dissidents, I can tell that for sure, first of all, this judicial system starts as nothing and creates nothing. The only function which it has is to give legitimate legal grounds for decisions which have already been made. That's the only function of this system, at least as far as political trials and dissidents and prisoners of Zion are concerned.

He goes on to say:

There are lawyers from the bar associations of the Soviet Union who are supposed to defend you. In my case, for example, in accordance with the law, I had the right to look for defense counsel or to ask my relatives or anybody whom I like to find a lawyer for me. I had the right to write them a note or even to meet with my relatives, and to discuss with them what kind of a lawyer I wanted.

But the authorities simply said no to all my requests. They refused to give me an opportunity to write to or to meet with my relatives and to say what kind of a lawyer I wanted. Nevertheless, my mother was lucky to find one lawyer who agreed to defend me. The lawyer who agreed to go to court and defend me based on the position that I am innocent, was expelled from the bar association and had to leave the country.

Instead, they tried to give me a lawyer who they chose themselves and though I refused to communicate with this lawyer, she came to the trial. When I stated that I wouldn't say one word at this trial, the lawyer was taken away. But the position from which she was going to defend me was quite obvious. This woman was going to state that of course there were crimes but look, it wasn't he who was responsible for the others and he is young and so on, to try to make it a collective crime and not my personal crime.

There was, in fact, collusion among the prosecutor, lawyer and judge. Of course, the most primitive role was the role of the judge who had simply to read the sentence which

was prepared by the KGB in advance. In fact, he didn't change even one word in the 40-page sentence.

It's one of the many examples. Every dissident who went through this can give his example of how it worked.

He went on then to cite some examples.

I close with this conclusion from his testimony.

When those people who really speak on behalf of the law or even try to use Soviet law to protect the rights of people in prison, whether they are for example Helsinki group monitors or activists of Amnesty International; whether they are Jews struggling for their rights or the rights of others to emigrate, these are the real colleagues of the American lawyers who defend the same rights here in America.

American lawyers however, have reached an agreement not with their colleagues who are in the Soviet prisons and camps. They've reached an agreement with that Soviet body whose main function is to give legality to the Soviet dictatorship, to give legality to the destruction of these laws. I think it's one of the most disgraceful acts of the Western free society which is exactly that type of policy which Gorbachev needs and which he tries to initiate all the time.

He goes on:

Here come American lawyers whose role in defending human rights all over the world is known very well. Also in my case I'm very thankful to many American and other Western lawyers. But they reached an agreement with the Soviet lawyers which helps the Soviets to say that they are the same type of body as the American one. They say, "Well, we will discuss with them human rights principles." The lip service is not what is needed.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to quote this eloquent testimony because I think it bears witness better than any of us, better than anything we could say, to the point that this kind of cooperation between very well-meaning groups in the United States and propagandists in the Soviet Union is action which plays into the hands of the Government of the Soviet Union, and as a result of that kind of action, by being dupes in this country, we do not further the advance of human rights; rather, we permit a situation to occur which results in dispirit and does not result in the advancement of human rights in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join my colleagues today in again trying to bring attention to this problem, because as I said in the beginning, it is only by speaking out, by putting the cold hard focus of public scrutiny on the actions of the Soviets that we can hope to influence their actual deeds. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following additional material:

THE POSITION OF THE UNION OF COUNCILS FOR SOVIET JEWS ON THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT WITH THE ASSOCIATION OF SOVIET LAWYERS

(Revised December, 1986)

In August, 1986, the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews issued a statement urging abrogation of the "Administrative Agreement" formulated between the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers. Subsequently, the ABA announced that the agreement had been superseded by a "Declaration of Cooperation Between the ABA and the ASL." The UCSJ, comprised of 55,000 members and 35 affiliated councils, remains unalterably opposed to any agreement, even in a modified form. The UCSJ urges the American Bar Association to promptly abrogate the agreement with the ASL as stipulated by the Huntwork/Jejna Resolution.

Advocates of the agreement with the ASL have argued that dialogue between American and Soviet lawyers will help to promote the cause of human rights. But, in fact, any such agreement between the ABA and the ASL will simply bestow upon the ASL, and by inference the Soviet legal system, an undesired aura of legitimacy and respectability within the international community.

As Anatoly Shcharansky has noted, the American Bar Association mistakenly views the Association of Soviet Lawyers as its counterpart in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, he contends, the real colleagues of American lawyers, men committed to justice and due process, are in prisons throughout the USSR.

The ASL is not an independent, autonomous organization but is an arm of the Soviet government. The ASL's concerns range far beyond the matters traditionally considered to be the province of lawyers. The ASL is the most prominent official sponsor and publisher of anti-Semitic material in the USSR. Together with the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, the ASL is co-author and co-publisher of the infamous White Book, a scathing denunciation of the so-called "international Zionist conspiracy." There is not a shred of evidence to suggest that the members of an organization like the ASL, the publisher of blatantly anti-Semitic material, could have the slightest interest in fostering the development of human rights through the law.

The ASL is an integral part of the mechanism for prosecution of Soviet Jewish citizens who are tried and convicted on trumped up charges. At the precise time the ASL was negotiating an agreement with the ABA, its members were engaged in the fabrication of evidence used to convict Soviet Jewish refusenik Vladimir Lifshitz. He is now serving three years in the Siberian Gulag.

Surely there can be no more vivid examples of the Soviet Union's disregard for human rights and the provisions of the Helsinki Accords.

Despite its signature on the Accords, the Soviet Union has failed to comply with any of the Accords' human rights provisions. The Soviet government has ignored provisions which allow citizens free movement between borders, respect for the religious, cultural and human rights of all citizens, and the prompt reunification of separated families.

On the contrary, there has not been the slightest indication of any relaxation in the Soviet policy of denying the right of emigration to nearly 400,000 of its Jewish citizens.

The Union of Councils believes that an agreement—either in its original or its modified form—between the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers serves only to enhance the image of a reprehensible arm of Soviet repression.

The Union of Councils re-emphasizes its support for the Huntwork/Jejna Resolution, which calls upon the ABA to quickly abrogate its agreement with the ASL.

To: The Union of Councils for Soviet Jews.  
From: Natan (Anatoly) Shcharansky.

Date: July 1st 1986.

Re: Agreement between the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers.

You have asked for my opinion regarding the agreement on co-operation between the American Bar Association (ABA) and the Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL). As I have explained before, the Soviets want to present a human face to the world. Such a false face enables the Soviets to continue their inhuman violations against entire nations. In order to present their false face, the Soviets need the help of co-operative Western bodies. By entering into the agreement with the ASL, the ABA helps the Soviet regime to mask from the world its real face.

It is important to understand that the ASL does not represent independent opinion of Soviet lawyers (to have such opinions is against the law). It can only represent the official point of view and because of that covers up countless human rights violations. This organization is one of the main advocates of the Soviet State's anti-Semitic policy. If American lawyers want true dialogue, why do they not suggest to their Russian colleagues, for example, that a committee be organized for the mutual monitoring of possible human rights violations in both countries? Or to send American representatives to the trials of the dissidents in the Soviet Union and the Soviet lawyers to the trials which draw their attention in America?

There is practically no doubt that the ASL would never agree to such a thing. But at least such proposals help to see the real intentions of this organization and to unmask them. So I support the efforts of American lawyers Huntwork and Jejna to persuade the ABA to terminate the ABA-ASL agreement.

NATAN SHCHARANSKY.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland and the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this special order before us today.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here today to focus attention on the plight of Soviet Jewry. The time is now for the leadership of this country to demand that the doors to freedom be opened, and that the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union be reunited with their families.

The Soviet leadership wants to show a new face to the world and all of us encourage this new openness, but it is incumbent on the Soviet Union to



prove this is more than just empty rhetoric.

One positive expression of the Soviet's new face would certainly be to grant an exit visa to Vladimir and Maria Slepak. Several weeks ago, Soviet officials published a list of eight refusenik families who were told they would never receive permission to emigrate. Former prisoner of conscience, Mr. Slepak, and his wife Maria were among those listed. For 17 years the Slepaks have waited and worked toward the bettering of human rights for Jews in the Soviet Union. And now, they are told they may never leave. Because of this new development, Alexander Slepak is currently engaged in a hunger strike on the Capitol grounds, while his parents are on a hunger strike together in Moscow. The Slepaks will continue their fast for 17 days, representing the 17 years of refusal. Mr. Slepak's only crime is that he has given direction, spirit, and soul to the Jewish immigration movement in the Soviet Union.

I would also like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join supporters of human rights for Soviet Jewry from around the country in a National Freedom Seder for Soviet Jews on Tuesday, April 7. This observance will provide a unique opportunity for Members of Congress to sit with Jewish community leaders and participate in the telling of the story of a modern exodus from the Soviet Union which relates to the first exodus from ancient Egypt. A special program will be held and a traditional Passover meal will be served.

Let us work together to reunite all of those who seek freedom. The spirit personified by the Jewish community in the Soviet Union can never be suppressed. We ask the Soviet Government to respect the dignity and human rights of all its citizens and allow those who wish to emigrate to be allowed to do so without delay.

Now is the time for the Soviet Union to do what is right, for the time is always right to do right.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in December 1973 the Congress voted for passage of the Jackson/Vanik amendment to the 1973 Trade Reform Act. I voted for the amendment then and would proudly vote for it again today. This amendment stated that the United States would prohibit most-favored-nation trade status and Export-Import Bank credits to Communist countries which do not permit free emigration.

Also in December 1973 the Anisimov family of Derbent, applied for an exit visa to leave the Soviet Union. All we know about the Anisimovs is that they are Jewish and that they want to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. We also know that they have courage, and that they have patience, because today, over 13 years later, they are still waiting for their exit visas.

They are still awaiting their visas although the Jackson/Vanik amendment is still in force. Today, in an effort to help the Anisimov family and other such families in the U.S.S.R., we reaffirmed that commitment in passing House Concurrent Resolution 34. Again we do what we can to assist Soviet Jewry to emigrate and to stop Soviet human rights violations.

The Anisimovs still believe that they can be free. I had hoped 12 years ago, when I last served in Congress, that they would soon be free.

During the last year we have been heartened by the positive developments occurring in the Soviet Union. These include the releases of Anatoly Shcharansky, Yuri Orlov, and David Goldfarb, and the permission given Andrei Sakharov and Yelena Bonner to leave Gorki and return to Moscow. Furthermore, we are heartened to hear that in the last few months more people have been granted exit visas than at any time since late 1981; 200,000 Jews have been released since we passed the Jackson/Vanick amendment.

Finally, I am heartened to read in today's Washington Post that Morris B. Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Edgar Bronfman, chairman of the World Jewish Congress, after having met with Soviet Government officials last week, believe that the Soviet Union will soon begin once more to permit large-scale Jewish emigration, and increased cultural and religious freedom to those Jews who wish to remain in the Soviet Union.

I wish to echo Mr. Abram when he states:

We now await Soviet performance on all these fronts, for only then are we prepared to say that Glasnost is a real process and that it includes Jews.

Hopefully, all the Anisimov's of the Soviet Union will one day be free. There are apparently 400,000 who still want to leave. In the season of rebirth, we must again look to those that are not free whose hopes are reborn with springtime flowers. At this time of year, during the celebration of Easter and Passover, we declare anew to the leaders of the Soviet Union, allow free emigration now.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, I had a chance to meet briefly with Alexander Slepak. Mr. Slepak is nearly a third of the way through a 17-day hunger strike which symbolizes the 17 years his parents have been denied permission to emigrate. Why is that? The Soviets say it's because of the fact that they formerly held jobs which exposed them to government secrets. Perhaps. But it has been nearly two decades since they were even remotely involved in any such work—a time that found Vladimir Slepak having spent 5 years in jail for his efforts to try and emigrate.

The Soviets say they are practicing Glasnost or openness, but the evidence is difficult to find. And, even members of our own press fall victim to the Soviets' efforts. A recent segment of the CBS program "60 Minutes" proved to

be a big disservice to the efforts help refuseniks win their battle to leave the Soviet Union. Did the crew and reporters think for a minute that they were really presented an accurate picture of Soviet Jewry? Their claim that Soviet Jews more or less live satisfying lives flies in the face of the nearly 400,000 Jews who continue to wait for permission to emigrate, Jews who have been subject to harassment, removal from their jobs, exile and/or prison for simply having made that request.

In today's New York Times, there is a report that Moscow is preparing to allow—what it calls—a major increase in Jewish emigration. In addition, the Soviets say they will soon allow the importation of religious books, an opening of synagogues where there is a demonstrated need, and the establishment of a kosher restaurant.

Meanwhile, only last month, the Soviet named eight refusenik families who they said would never be permitted to emigrate because of their earlier employment in secret government work. Mr. Slepak, who I mentioned earlier, is the son of one of those families. Yet, again today in that same New York Times article, we read that those 8 families would be allowed to have their cases reviewed.

Clearly, if the Soviet Government is sincere and if glasnost is to have any real meaning, then those 8 families—and all Soviet families who desire to emigrate—should be granted permission to do so unconditionally.

Let's see some action—since actions do speak louder than words. Let us see Jews in the Soviet Union practicing their religion openly and unchallenged. Let us see those Soviet citizens—Jews and non-Jews—who wish to make their life elsewhere be allowed to do just that.

Then, and only then, will we have reason to believe the Soviets are giving us more than just empty words.

□ 1800

Mrs. MORELLA. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Lewis]. He and I have the honor of serving together as freshman representatives on a conference of Soviet Jewry. He speaks with great passion and conviction.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite relevant that the last speaker was our colleague from Georgia. If one were to go down the street to the Smithsonian Institution and walk into the section dedicated to movements, they would find a picture of a Life magazine cover with our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Lewis], crossing the bridge at Selma, AL.

I would point out that if one were to read the article they would find that those people who walked across that bridge, who went down that long road, who sat in the buses and sat in the lunchrooms, were considered to be leaders, potential martyrs, certainly heroes.

If one were to take any of the publications in the Soviet Union that are approved by the government and they saw a picture of a Soviet Jew, I would think that they would not find them described as potential martyrs, as leaders, as individuals who are on the forefront of freedom. They would be considered to be those who are disruptive of the public policy; they would be called hooligans; they would be called individuals not fit to reside within the state.

Yet at the same time, just recently, on television, Mr. Gorbachev said that:

There is no country where Jews have as many rights as in the U.S.S.R. If there is a problem of reunions among family members, we accept that. When do we prevent the resolution of such problems? When the applicant knows state secrets. Then we give him the possibility of waiting.

In other words, nothing is wrong, therefore, nothing will change.

Since taking office Mr. Gorbachev's policy of glasnost or openness has been disappointing. I am encouraged by the release of Anatoly Shcharansky and Iosif Begun and the fact that 400 Soviet Jews have so far received permission to emigrate this month, yet life remains very difficult, especially for the refuseniks.

To be a Jew in Russia today is to face a living death. Prospects for a normal life, an education, a job, a future, have never been bleaker; yet even to ask to emigrate is to risk persecution, to face imprisonment.

Jewish cultural and religious expression has long been restricted, and there are apparent obstacles to its preservation. There are no Hebrew or Yiddish schools. Publication in those tongues and language instruction is extremely limited, and less than 60 synagogues remain open. Rabbinical training is nonexistent.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading a story about Nadezhda Fradkova, who in 1978 applied for a visa to emigrate to Israel. She lived and worked in Leningrad as a linguist. When she applied for the visa, she was told that she must receive her father's permission to emigrate. She could not believe her ears. Her father divorced her mother 31 years ago, before she was born. She had never even met him. She protested and reapplied for a new visa. It was to no avail. She lost her job and had to support herself as a cleaning woman and by giving private language lessons. Years passed. In March 1983 she started a hunger strike. The KGB dragged her off to a hospital. She was drugged and force-fed. She was eventually re-

leased. Soon after that she went on another hunger strike. She was arrested again and taken to a psychiatric hospital where she was registered as mentally disturbed. In July 1985 she was kept in total isolation and in September she stood trial for political crimes. She was sentenced to a labor camp for 2 years in the Arctic north.

Mr. Speaker, as long as Nadezhda Fradkova is not free, Russian Jews are not free. As long as Russian Jews are not free, American Jews are not free. As long as American Jews are not free, all Americans are not free. And as long as any American is not free, we here in this forum of freedom must speak out, not just today, but every day. Speak out to the press, to Mr. Gorbachev, to the world, and yes, Mr. Speaker, to God.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I must begin by saying the most necessary thing, albeit an unpleasant one: the announcements in today's newspapers about reported Soviet plans for sharp increases in Jewish emigration are not unqualified good news. They deserve no more and no less attention than was given the statement of Historian Martin Gilbert in December, that "Anatoly Shcharansky's release coincided with a year when more Russian Jews were arrested and imprisoned than at any time since the death of Stalin."

I do not mean that today we should not be pleased for the good fortune of the 11,000 or 12,000 who have waited for so many years. What is necessary is a note of extreme caution. It would be counterproductive if naive people were to greet this news of today as proof that there is seriousness about democratic reform and substance to glasnost. There isn't; Glasnost is 97 percent fraud, just as the freedom of 11,000 Soviet Jews—if it comes—would leave 97 percent of the larger community of would-be Jewish emigres under Soviet rule. If a government has locked up people unjustly, and in violation of international agreements it has itself signed, then it hardly deserves applause for opening the door a crack and letting 3 percent of the prisoners free.

It was only 2 months ago that Nathan Shcharansky, whose courage is nothing less than an example for all time, predicted that General Secretary Gorbachev would do precisely what this morning's papers tell us he may now do. Shcharansky explained that a new emigration law forbids applications for emigration from people without immediate relatives abroad. For example, those with uncles and aunts outside the Soviet Union cannot apply. With the stroke of the pen then, the authorities reduced the hopeful among the standing applicant pool from 382,000 to some 30,000. "The next step for Gorbachev in his diplomacy of gestures" Shcharansky explained, "will be to use these 30,000 as investment capital . . . he will permit (them) to leave over 5 and 6 years, and it will look like a big improvement" because only 800 or 900 escaped during 1986.

Mr. Speaker, that is what Shcharansky predicted in early February, and that is what makes this morning's news less than an occasion for rejoicing.

But there are other games being played here by the man Shcharansky acidly calls "the big liberator." He shared a cell, just before his own release last year, with a man who had been a top Soviet official with access to information on the extent of the Soviet Gulag. The man was able to confirm the educated guesses of the Jewish community in the USSR. There are some 5 million slaves in the camps controlled by the same General Secretary who is getting great press for permitting the showing of a film about Stalin's excesses. In addition to those five million prisoners there are another 6 million whom Shcharansky calls "half-slaves", men and women confined to work in isolated communities in half freedom. Finally, there are the 800 to 900 political prisoners known to Soviet human rights activists by name, as well as an estimated 5,000 to 10,000 others incarcerated for purely political reasons.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the grim essence of the Soviet regime. There is the apparatus, still doing its deadly and deadening work, which is covered over by the smiles of the Politburo's newest diplomatist. There, quickened by those eleven million souls, is the human material which the ceaseless mills of totalitarianism are still trying to reduce to a uniform grade a full seven decades after the revolution.

Mr. Speaker, the new politics of Glasnost have done little but paint pretty pictures on the Iron Curtain. And the new Politburo chief is getting undeserved credit for baring the truth about Stalin—something Khrushchev did decades ago—while doing nothing serious about changing the totalitarian apparatus that made Stalinism not only possible but repeatable.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, today over 2½ million Jews are trapped in a country that's impossible for them to live in, and impossible to leave. Since 1979, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union has plummeted by a shocking 98 percent. In 1979, a record number of Soviet Jews emigrated from the Soviet Union—51,320. In 1984, only 896 Jews were allowed to leave. This figure represents the first time since the landmark Leningrad trials of 1970-71 that fewer than 1,000 Jews received permission to leave in a single year. For those Jews who remain behind, life has become more miserable than ever.

Once a Jew applies to leave the Soviet Union, in order to live freely as a Jew or be reunited with family members in Israel, his or her entire life changes. Would-be emigrants are fired from their jobs, and may then be arrested for not having one.

Of the 20,000 refuseniks who have already been denied permission to emigrate, some have waited for over 15



years. Almost 400,000 have begun the difficult and uncertain emigration process.

The emigration process is extremely difficult and requires a tremendous amount of documentation, and many obstacles are placed in their way. All applicants for exit visas must submit copies of the following to the local visa office: invitation from relatives in Israel; document of employment status; proof of residency; birth and marriage certificates; photographs; university diplomas; statement of intent and autobiography; parental or spousal permissions; and fee—cost for a family of four is approximately \$5,880.

There are various reasons that permission to emigrate is denied. Among these are: denial of visa on the basis of access to state secrets; minimum 5-year waiting period following military service; and restrictions of invitations to first degree relatives living in Israel.

Once an application is denied, another cannot be filed for 6 months. In addition, refuseniks must now submit a completely new set of documents each time they reapply.

Those Soviet Jews who have applied to emigrate and have been denied, don't give in, and they don't give up. Stubbornly and repeatedly they bring their application to the visa office. Their reason to emigrate 1 or 3 or 15 years ago, their desire to live in Israel, to reunite with their families, is bolstered by a new reason: A person should not live in a country where their right to practice their religion is denied.

I would like to cite the example of one family who has tried to emigrate from the Soviet Union since 1978 and have been denied. Mark and Frieda Budnyatsky and their daughter, Anne, first applied for visas in December 1978. Permission to emigrate was denied in July 1979, on the grounds of access to secret information. Mark Budnyatsky was an electronics engineer who worked in a scientific research laboratory, Frieda Budnyatsky was a chemical engineer. They left their jobs prior to applying for emigration, so that could not be used as a reason to deny permission to emigrate, however, it was, and they were told it would be at least 10 years before they could reapply. Mark now stokes a boiler and Frieda is a file clerk.

This family could lead very productive, fulfilled lives outside the Soviet Union and that is what they seek, the opportunity to emigrate. The Budnyatskys should not have to wait 10 years to realize their dream of a life free to celebrate their holidays and practice their religion.

I applaud the efforts of the many individuals, including Morris Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Edgar Bronfman, chairman of the World Jewish Con-

gress, who have worked tirelessly on behalf of those Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate, especially the 11,000 long-term refuseniks, such as the Budnyatskys, whose previous applications have been rejected.

Our purpose here today is to assist in those efforts, to bring attention to the plight of these people seeking refuge from cultural and religious harassment, to help make the prediction of the promise of emigration, a reality.

□ 1810

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and continued concern that I rise today in support of Soviet Jewry. For too long Jews in the Soviet Union have been persecuted and harassed, despite official proclamations and international obligations to respect their basic human rights.

Today there are reports that a new government in Moscow is adopting a more tolerant attitude towards the aspirations of Soviet Jews. More Soviet Jews are being allowed to leave the Soviet Union than at any time since the late 1970's, and promises have been made that Jews who wish to remain in the Soviet Union will be allowed greater religious and cultural freedom.

If these reports are true, and I hope they are, this could be the evidence that we have been waiting for that our perseverance on behalf of Soviet Jewry is having some effect. For several years private citizens and Members of Congress have been insisting that the Soviet Union honor its commitments to its own citizens that it made when it signed the Helsinki accords. We have been writing letters on behalf of Soviet Jews and encouraging the executive branch to press for their release. Perhaps now we are beginning to see the rewards of our efforts.

While this news is welcome, the Soviet leadership should be put on notice that the West will be watching to see if this new toleration will continue in the months and years ahead, or if it is just a tactical move to secure greater trade with the West.

At the same time, we must not forget that the Soviet Union, for 6 years, was in blatant violation of the Helsinki accords. We must remember that the Soviet Union caused immense hardship for Soviet Jews. The Kremlin must not be praised for easing the suffering that it caused.

Finally, we must remember that a government like the Soviet Union can return to its repressive policies of the past just as easily as it has apparently adopted a more humane policy. Continued vigilance by the West will be

necessary to ensure that Soviet Jews enjoy the rights the Soviet Government promised them in the Helsinki accords.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to congratulate and commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for her sincere and persistent efforts on behalf of Soviet Jews, and for calling this special order today.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her kind comments as well as her cogent comments on Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of this House for its action earlier today in approving House Concurrent Resolution 34 which sets as a priority for this 100th Congress a focus on the continuing human rights abuses against Jews in the Soviet Union.

As this Nation celebrates the 200th anniversary of those documents which established our freedoms, I believe it is proper to focus on the failure of another world superpower to extend such freedoms of their peoples.

In recent months, Soviet officials have lulled the whole world into believing there is a new openness and a change in human rights policies. But the record indicates that is far from the truth.

Last year, for instance, only 914 Jews were permitted to emigrate from that country, compared with 1,140 in 1985 and 896 in 1984.

Nearly 400,000 Jews in the Soviet Union have petitioned to leave that country. Of this number, more than 11,000 hold the status of refusenik. These persons continue to be refused permission to be reunited with family and repatriated to Israel. Some of these have been waiting for 15 years.

In 1975, 35 countries including the U.S.S.R., signed the so-called Helsinki accords in which they solemnly adopted principles for advancing peace and cooperation. They also promised to respect freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

For those Soviet Jews who want to remain in the U.S.S.R., the Government should grant them the right to study and express their religious and cultural heritage, free from prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in all our dealings with the Soviets, we must constantly remind them of these violations and demand that they be corrected before granting them concessions in any of our dealings including cultural, scientific, and trade exchanges.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Mary-

land, the gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this special order before the Congress.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I very much would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Arizona for their invitation to participate in this special order on Glasnost.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the Geneva summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, there has been intense interest in our country about exchanges between our citizens and the peoples of the Soviet Union.

I believe that exchanges can serve the causes of peace and freedom. But only if we think about them strategically.

Why are we interested in exchanges between the United States and the U.S.S.R.? Because we have a lot to learn about the many different peoples living in the Soviet empire. Because they have a lot to learn about us. Because getting at each others' heads may keep us from each others' throats.

These are good reasons for exchange. But they're not enough.

There is a lot of misunderstanding and bad communication between the United States and the Soviet Union. But that misunderstanding is not the root of the conflict between us. We fool ourselves if we think it is. Conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union stems from one great fact: We are a democracy, and they are a Leninist tyranny. Here, the people rule. There, a privileged elite, the members of the Communist Party, rule. Here, we celebrate diversity; there, pluralism is a disease to be eradicated.

Exchange can be an important instrument for opening the windows of a closed society. And that would be an important step toward real peace. Human rights and peace aren't two issues, to be "linked" or not as the politics of the situation demand. Human rights and peace are two sides of the same issue. A Soviet Union keeping the international obligations to which it solemnly bound itself in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act, would be a Soviet Union with which we're likely to do serious business in arms reduction.

On the other hand, a Soviet Union in which men are imprisoned for teaching Hebrew and women sent to labor camps for writing Christian poetry is not a country on which we

are going to be willing to bet our future, and the human future.

If exchange programs help support the independent people of the Soviet Union; if they help break down the Leninist monopoly of power in Soviet society; if they make true communication between us possible—then exchanges will serve the causes of peace and freedom.

But if exchanges only serve to reward the privileged sons and daughters of the Communist Party elite; if exchanges become instruments of Soviet propaganda; if the net result of exchange programs is that we understand less about the true state of affairs for the peoples of the U.S.S.R.—then it's hard to see how either peace or freedom has been served.

Throughout this year, some of our congressional colleagues will be participating in a "spacebridge" exchange program with members of the Supreme Soviet. These televised discussions could be exchanges that serve the causes of peace and freedom. But in order to do that, our colleagues are going to have to make several important things clear.

First, our colleagues are going to have to say that they understand who they're talking with.

Members of the Supreme Soviet aren't legislators, at least in the Western sense of the term. To present this "spacebridge" as a meeting between two groups of "parliamentarians" is simply false. Members of the Supreme Soviet are worth talking to because they're senior members of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.; they have considerable influence within their country. But, especially in this year of our own constitutional bicentennial, let's not demean ourselves and fall into the Orwellian trap of describing them as "parliamentarians." The parliamentarians are all on our side of the spacebridge.

Second, our congressional colleagues should make it clear that the root of the conflict between our two countries—or, better, between the United States and the rulers of the Soviet Union—is ideological and political. It isn't a matter of misunderstanding, though misunderstanding there may be. It isn't a matter of bad communication, though better communication we need. The root of the conflict is that our revolution looks to Jefferson, and their's looks to Lenin.

Third, let our colleagues challenge the misunderstanding of American society that pervades the Soviet leadership elite. Let's have a little Glasnost about America. Let's make it clear to the members of the Supreme Soviet that this country isn't ruled by a cabal of munitions manufacturers. Let's try to help them understand what an opposition party is, and a free press, and fair elections, and religious liberty. Americans may carry a lot of stereo-

types about the peoples of the Soviet Union in their heads; but the leadership of the Soviet Union carries a lot of stereotypes about the way the United States works in its collective head. Let's challenge that.

Fourth, let's make it clear that peace and freedom go together over the long run. We'd love to believe that the Leninist winter was melting in the Soviet Union. How would we know that that's the case? What's the difference between glasnost and glitz? Let's apply five tests:

First, freedom for all political prisoners.

Second, free emigration.

Third, no more kangaroo court trials of political dissidents.

Fourth, freedom of worship for all, and an end to state "registration" of churches and synagogues.

Fifth, dissent in the official press or, even better, the emergence of a real opposition press.

Let our colleagues in the "spacebridge" press the members of the Supreme Soviet on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, the issue isn't whether there are going to be exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union—the issue is what kind of exchanges, aimed at what goals. I think our goal should be to support the independent people of the Soviet Union—the human rights activists, the religious believers, the independent peace movement. Let our colleagues, in their spacebridge discussions with members of the Supreme Soviet, become voices for the voiceless. Let them take up the cause of the independent people of the Soviet Union. Let them speak for peace and freedom.

□ 1820

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and giving us all a chance to speak out on this most pressing issue of Soviet refuseniks detained in the Soviet Union. I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on such an important human rights matter.

While I am concerned about all refuseniks wishing to emigrate, I would like to speak about just three. I have adopted two refuseniks in the Soviet Union, and I keep in contact with them in the U.S.S.R. The first of the refuseniks, Lev Gendin, is currently living in the Soviet Union with his wife and two sons. He has requested emigration for his entire family, but his requests have been rejected by Soviet officials. The plight of a second refusenik, Boris Chernobilsky, has recently come to my attention, and I have begun correspondence with him



as well. The third refusenik I am concerned with is in the special divided spouse category. Pyatras Pakenas has requested emigration 16 times but has been refused each time by Soviet officials. It has been 6 years since Pyatras has seen his wife, a resident of my district and a new American citizen. He has never seen his 6-year-old grandson.

This evening his wife, Dr. Vileshina, sits in my office in her mission, and I might say heroic mission, of bringing Pyatras here to the United States to be with her.

These people are just a sample of 400,000 refuseniks wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union. General Secretary Gorbachev has repeatedly promised to relax emigration policies for the refuseniks, but so far he has not fulfilled his promise. Time and again Soviet citizens are denied emigration, and some are penalized for requesting it. It is time we, the American people, ban together and insist that the Soviets, once and for all, commit to the Helsinki Final Act and allow all Soviets the freedom to emigrate if they wish to.

I would like to appeal to the sense of fairness, justice, and compassion of those in the Soviet Government. It does not benefit your society to keep these people in the Soviet Union against their will. I cannot believe that these people contribute very much toward the achievement or the perfection of a Communist society. The cost of monitoring their activities and responding to inquiries on their behalf must be a significant drain on the resources of your state.

Secretary Gorbachev, I was very interested in the comments that you had in your discussions with Prime Minister Thatcher in the Soviet Union yesterday in which you mentioned that you would be glad to talk about human rights if this could be expanded to talk about the plight of the homeless and the unemployed.

Mr. Gorbachev, I believe that you will find that the American statesmen with which you will be speaking are not only good speakers, but good listeners; but I warn you: Freedom-loving Americans would rather sleep homeless on the grates of Washington, DC, than live imprisoned in the Soviet Union.

Once again I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] for the opportunity to speak out on such an important issue as this.

The only hope these refuseniks have to leave the Soviet Union is for the United States to stand behind them as we have stood behind other victims of human rights violations throughout the years. We must all band together and stick together in this fight against

repression in hopes that one day all citizens of the world will be free.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] is adopting refuseniks in his remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding to me. I also want to thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Georgia for the fine job they have done tonight in organizing this special order.

I think it is appropriate that this body talk about this issue, even though the front page of the Washington Post today has an article which is entitled "Jewish Leader Predicts Soviets Will Let Thousands Emigrate," some might say, as a result of that article, that perhaps this is a needless special order.

I say very much to the contrary. There could be no better time to call attention to the Soviet claims of change and reform, and our purpose today should be to ensure that world attention is focused; focused squarely on seeing that the Soviets do follow through on their expressions of good will.

What it all boils down to is the credibility of General Secretary Gorbachev's policy of glasnost, or openness. Does glasnost represent a change in public policy, or merely public relations? Does glasnost represent real reform or just renewed rhetoric?

Does glasnost represent a change in the face of the Soviet bear or is he simply wearing a new mask?

All of these questions need to be answered.

□ 1830

But whether the thoughts of changes that Morris Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, talks of in today's Post article, Mr. Speaker, whether those will come to pass will be a big part of the answers to these questions.

All friends of Soviet Jewry should be encouraged simply by the discussion of these sorts of far ranging reforms, reforms that include importation of Jewish religious books, they are now to be allowed; a kosher restaurant will be opened; ritual slaughtering to produce kosher meat will be allowed; synagogues will be opened; rabbinical students will be permitted to leave the Soviet Union to study; and the teaching of Hebrew in schools will be permitted.

Perhaps most significantly, emigration of 11,000 long-term refuseniks will be allowed.

While Mr. Abram's observations are encouraging, it is Soviet actions, not promises, on which the policy of glasnost, will rise or fall and be judged by humanity.

As Mr. Abram notes, we now await Soviet performance on all these fronts, for only then are we prepared to say that glasnost is a real process and that it includes Jews.

Our challenge, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that Soviet deeds match Soviet words. We need to keep focused the hot glare of public opinion so that these reforms survive to be written about again in the Washington Post. Only then, the next headline should read: "Soviet emigration proceeds at record pace, exceeds 1979 level of 51,000."

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for speaking so movingly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I would inquire of the gentlewoman as to how much time remains?

Mrs. MORELLA. I understand we have 1 minute and I think the gentleman from Texas can do it in a minute.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will, but I am going to take a good part of that time, at the conclusion of this program, to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for both her sensitivity in helping these human beings trapped in the Soviet Union, her leadership of today and in the past before her service in Congress and in the future on this issue and her effectiveness in representing the views of her constituents.

I would just bring the words of one group of refuseniks in Leningrad whom my wife and I and several colleagues visited with in July 1985. When we inquired, we did not know the word at the time, glasnost, but we inquired of these refuseniks the general question, "Do you believe General Secretary Gorbachev is different?" They looked at one another and then they looked at us and they said, "We will believe that General Secretary Gorbachev is different when Gorbachev acts differently."

I think that is what America and the world is waiting on; not words, but deeds, so that 6 months from now or 1 year from now we can indeed know that glasnost is hopefully meaningful and that the Soviet Union has acted differently with regard to their international obligations under the Helsinki accords and their obligation to their own citizens.

I think the gentlewoman for yielding and yield back to her.

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for waiting so long.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from Georgia, and I yield brief-

ly to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. KYL.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to quote for the record the source of the testimony which I read earlier from Anatoly Shcharansky. He was testifying before the Commission of Inquiry on Soviet Human Rights Violations, a public hearing in the Russell Senate Office Building on January 23, 1987, before Commissioners: Senator WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Senator Richard B. Stone and Mr. Stuart E. Elzenstat.

Again I want to thank my colleague from Georgia, my colleague from Maryland for assisting in putting this special order together on this very important subject.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representative JON KYL, and Representative CONSTANCE MORELLA for sponsoring this special order to address the human rights struggles of Soviet Jews.

Recently, the West has been witness to a new era and style of Soviet political and economic life. We have been assured that, as Winston Churchill once said, the "enigma inside of a mystery, surrounded by a question mark" that is the Soviet Union has been stripped away layer by layer to reveal a more open, conciliatory and dynamic nation. The birth of Glasnost has been trumpeted and promulgated to all that will listen. We have heard of a revamped Soviet economic engine, of shackles being lifted off of the Soviet press, and of a Soviet leader shaking off the cobwebs of the antiquated Politburo to emerge as a man of peace.

These are lofty and grandiose designs to accomplish in a lifetime of sincere effort and dedication, let alone in a few months of glad-handing gestures, bereft of much substance. While I am encouraged by the direction which the Soviet Union appears to be taking, I am weary of the Soviet Union's past and present human rights policy, which reflect the true spirit and character of a nation.

Focusing a cold, sober eye on the Soviet Union's continued blatant disregard for the fundamental rights of Soviet Jews, rights which we are fortunate to have here in America by virtue of our birthright, makes it easy to separate the fact from the fantasy, the performance from the expectation. While we are grateful for the recent release of the more publicized human rights cases of individuals like Natan Scharansky, and Yuri Orlov, there are 400,000 Jews still waiting to be granted this precious permission, each statistic representing a special, touching and in many instances, a tragic story.

Recently I visited Israel and became aware of an especially tragic Soviet Jewry family struggling to be reunited. Refused permission for over 10 years on the most spurious of reasons, Yuri Speizman and his wife remain isolated and severed from loved ones. Over 70 of my colleagues rallied with me to urge the release of Yuri, who is afflicted with leukemia, and his wife. Recently he was finally granted permission to emigrate, but only after he endured a near fatal heart attack. Soviet officials

sought to intimidate him, break his will to continue his quest for freedom and inflict punitive actions for the international support his case attracted. This was not the demonstration of compassion and Glasnost of a secure superpower, but a vindictive and petty action in adhering to a centuries' old policy of disrespect for fundamental human rights.

It is important that we rededicate ourselves to continuing our partnership with the many concerned organizations and committees here and abroad who seek daily to mitigate the suffering which Soviet Jews—seeking no more than the right to choose how and where to live their lives—must endure as an accepted price for keeping the flame of freedom burning bright.

In particular, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, cochaired by Representatives JOHN PORTER and STENY HOYER, must be recognized for their unstinting efforts in support of the protection of universal human rights and the International Cancer Patient Solidarity Committee for their commitment to alleviating the medical traumas endured by those emigres trapped in the Soviet system.

As we look to the future of Soviet Jewry, it is crucial that while we remain open to conciliation, and are encouraged by stated Soviet intentions of glasnost, we must insist that they demonstrate fidelity to the spirit of this new policy by hearing and respecting the poignant cries of the thousands of Soviet Jews to whom glasnost is more for the benefit of foreign consumption than for domestic tranquility.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues as a participant in this special order on behalf of Soviet Jewry.

While I am heartened by the active support demonstrated by this body today and on many previous occasions, I am also deeply saddened by the continued necessity for these special orders. The terrible plight of Jews in the Soviet Union is one of the most shameful wholesale violations of human rights in the world today.

Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev's much publicized policy of glasnost or openness, has yet to prove to be much more than tactical and cosmetic where it concerns Jews in the Soviet Union.

The new so-called progressive emigration decree actually offers little hope to the hundreds of thousands of Jews seeking the right to leave.

There had been some hope of a positive shift in Soviet policy when some refuseniks noted that the emigration decree, which updated a 1970 statute, had by implication recognized that departure was not a "criminal act," and that under certain conditions "ordinary citizens" could depart from the U.S.S.R.

However, upon closer inspection, the decree codified restrictive practices in effect since 1980, which allowed Jews to leave only on the basis of family reunification, rather than as a fundamental right. Seemingly humanitarian, it fixed in law the narrow definition of family as including only parents, children and siblings, condemning hundreds of thousands of people from ever applying for, much less receiving, permission to leave.

The new decree left Soviet authorities with absolute power to reject applications for emi-

gration. It ignored many of the human rights provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the more recent Helsinki accords, to which the Soviet Union is signatory.

The cold truth is that glasnost has changed little or nothing for Soviet Jews. Only 914 Jews were permitted to leave the Soviet Union in 1986, compared with 1,140 in 1985 and 896 the previous year. These figures are a far cry from the all-time high of 51,320 in 1979.

If the Soviet Union is truly serious about human rights, it need only free the prisoners of conscience, including those whom it has incarcerated for teaching Hebrew and insisting on the right to be repatriated to Israel; grant issuing visas to the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who have initiated the emigration procedures.

Last week I met with Mrs. Bronislava Gimpelson and her son, Alexandre, in my home district. Mrs. Gimpelson emigrated from the Soviet Union 10 years ago with her son, forced to divorce her husband in the process.

Her husband was denied a visa because Soviet officials said his work as an electrical engineer—which was terminated by Soviet officials 14 years ago—meant he had access to state secrets.

She said the divorce was not an easy step to take, but it was the only one for them because their son was quickly approaching draft age. Had he been inducted into the Soviet military, he, too, would have been denied an exit visa.

Mrs. Gimpelson's case is but one of many tragic situations that demonstrate the ongoing plight of Soviet Jews.

I will be visiting the Soviet Union in April as part of a House delegation, headed by our distinguished Speaker, JIM WRIGHT. Human rights remains my overriding concern. Hopefully through the effort of this bipartisan delegation under the eloquent leadership of Speaker WRIGHT, we can bring about real change for Soviet Jews.

Today's papers report that the Soviet Union has promised to permit thousands of Jews to emigrate to Israel this year on direct flights via the Soviet's East-bloc ally Romania, and will increase substantially Jewish religious and cultural freedom for those who remain. This came about as a result of talks between Soviet officials and two Western Jewish spokesmen, Morris B. Abram and Edgar M. Bronfman. We welcome such dialog and Soviet promises, and we await the Soviets to make good on their international obligations.

The Soviet Union must be made to understand that Soviet Jews are not alone in their struggle. Our voices will be heard.

There is a wide range of areas of concern to both superpowers. But progress in areas such as trade, scientific cooperation, cultural exchanges, to name just a few, is contingent on real progress in the area of human rights in the Soviet Union.

As always, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. We will be watching their moves closely now and in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in the first months of 1987, the Soviet Union's Glasnost



policy has had a visible effect upon the plight of the country's Jewish citizens. In the month of March, 450 Soviet Jews were granted permission to emigrate. That is more than half the number who were allowed to leave during the entire year of 1986. Last week Soviet officials met with two of America's leading activists for would-be Soviet Jewish emigres and assured them that the 11,000 long-term "refuseniks" would receive permission to leave within the year. These events are cause for some optimism.

But before we give the Soviets too much credit, we should remember that until 1979 emigration of Jewish citizens stood at a rate of about 4,000 per month. When the United States and 33 other nations signed the Helsinki accords with the Soviet Union in 1975, basic human rights were part of the agreement. General Secretary Gorbachev seems to perceive more clearly than did his predecessors the value of advocating those rights. Openness in society and freedom from religious persecution are not favored by all Politburo members, so Gorbachev's courage is to be commended. He needs the support of the world community in order that his policies will be implemented and those who have waited so long will be free. Many in the Soviet Union are watching the effects of his decisions, and there are those who believe that the "Moscow spring" will be short-lived.

It has been traditional in Soviet society that when a Jewish citizen applies for an exit visa, his life changes. He may lose his job or be harassed by the KGB. He faces the prospect of becoming a social outcast, and some citizens face arrest. Societies do not change overnight. New policies handed down by governments do not stamp change on the mood of the people. We must continue to monitor both the progress of emigration promised and the status of Secretary Gorbachev and his policies. We must work to offer legitimate and responsible compromises in trade in return for favorable human rights decisions, and we must not let even the tiniest hint of openness and change go unnoticed.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to this effort to call on the Soviet Union to live up to its human rights obligations. In particular, we must continue to demand that the Soviet Union end its repression of Jews in that country.

Today I want to focus on the plight of one family that is an example of the denial of basic human rights to all Soviet Jews. Naum Kogan, his wife Zhanna Kazacminer and their two daughters have been trying to obtain exit visas for over 10 years. Despite Secretary Gorbachev's announced policy of glasnost, the Kogans were again refused visas on March 11.

Why are the Kogans a refusenik family? What crime have they committed? None. Naum and Zhanna were denied an exit visa in 1977 because Zhanna had worked as an engineer for the Institute of Communications, which Soviet officials claimed had security implications. The Kogans lost their jobs and have been denied exit visas ever since. They have obviously not been involved in any form of supposed classified work for over a decade. Sadly, as we have seen too many

times, facts and rational reasoning seem to have little meaning to the Soviet Government.

Like many of my colleagues, I have sent numerous letters to Soviet officials asking them to grant the Kogans an exit visa. As we all know, these requests are neither answered nor acknowledged. Our purpose in speaking here today is to reaffirm our commitment to work for the release of the Kogans and all Soviet Jews who want to emigrate or simply desire to be able to practice their religion without harassment from their own Government.

I will not end my efforts until Naum Kogan is able to join his family in the United States and I will continue to work with my colleagues to pressure the Soviet Union to truly begin their policy of glasnost.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the lady from Maryland and the gentleman from Arizona, for organizing this special order on Soviet Jewry.

The subject is always timely, but particularly so today when the House has before it House Concurrent Resolution 34, which expresses our very strong objections to the Soviet Union's consistent violation of the Helsinki final act and basic human rights. The bill focuses particularly on the new Soviet codification of the emigration laws, which makes it even more difficult for Jews, and other religious and ethnic minorities, to emigrate.

Today, Irina Ratushinskaya testified at a hearing of the Helsinki Commission. Irina is a poet, who was sentenced to 7 years of hard labor for her poetry and her commitment to human rights. Although she has been called a religious poet by the Soviet Government, she does not consider herself that. Irina says instead that she is one of many of her generation in the Soviet Union who has turned to God, and who has been punished for doing so. When Irina was in prison, she was incarcerated with women of all religions, and they tried to help each other. They prayed together, and celebrated together two Easters and one Passover.

I find this story quite moving, and indicative of the fact that it is not the Russian, or Georgian, or Ukrainian people who are repressing each others' beliefs, but the Soviet system which is attempting to repress any individuality.

That these attempts are failing is clearly indicated by the number of people, nearly half a million, who are willing to forgo the limited rights they enjoy and risk prison and torture in their quest for the right to emigrate.

We, in the West, who are blessed with freedom, are celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution. The Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence is a statement of the inalienable rights of all people. This freedom is indeed a blessing, and it also brings with it the responsibility of working to achieve freedom for all people.

If we do not speak for these people, they will have no voice. Political and religious dissidents in the Soviet Union are being imprisoned and tortured for expressing the desire to enjoy the same freedoms we guaranteed for ourselves with our Bill of Rights and our Declaration of Independence.

Irina and her husband, Igor Geraschenko, Natan Sharansky and his family, Lev Blitshteyn, and belatedly Inna Meiman, all were re-

leased from the Soviet Union because of pressure from the West. We must continue to exert this pressure through special orders, such as this one, through legislation such as House Concurrent Resolution 34, through "Dear Colleagues" and letters to the State Department and to Soviet officials by bringing up the issue in all our meetings with the Soviets. We must encourage the work of organizations which monitor and document closely the human rights situation, such as the Union of Councils on Soviet Jewry, the Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union, the Human Rights Caucus and the Helsinki Commission.

Once again, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to reiterate the strong stand the United States takes on behalf of Soviet Jews.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] for taking out this special order to focus on this very important human rights issue.

While there are nearly 380,000 Jews who have requested, and been denied permission to leave the Soviet Union, I have particular compassion for a very special group of refuseniks—those who suffer from cancer.

Under the best circumstances, cancer is a horrible disease. The plight of cancer patients in the Soviet Union is exacerbated by the unavailability of the latest treatments for that deadly disease. Soviet patients cannot choose a physician for treatment—they must accept whoever is assigned to the case; there is no opportunity to seek a second opinion, no opting for alternative or experimental treatment, no possibility of traveling to another location.

The situation is doubly difficult for Jewish cancer patients. In addition to suffering from the burden of cancer and its accompanying physical and psychological pain, they must live with the oppression and ostracism inflicted because they are Jews.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a vigil currently being held near the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Leon Charney is protesting the refusal of the Soviet Government to grant his brother, Benjamin, an exit visa so that he may seek cancer treatment.

Benjamin Charney is a 49-year-old mathematician who lives in Moscow. Since 1979 he has suffered from both malignant skin cancer and a critical heart condition that has required frequent emergency treatment and hospitalization. He has been separated from Leon, his only brother—their parents are dead—for 8 years. Appeals on his behalf have been made by this body beginning in July 1986, however the Soviet authorities refuse to grant permission for him to leave.

Mr. Speaker, the refusal of the Soviet Government to allow Benjamin Charney, and all cancer victims who need more sophisticated treatment, to leave the Soviet Union is both insensitive and inhumane. I ask my colleagues to join with me in the continuing struggle to secure the release of the Soviet cancer pa-

tients separated from family members in the West and to fight for the freedom of all refuseniks.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, Ilya Vaitsblit is 69 years old. He is the only member of his family who survived the Holocaust. He has never seen his only grandson and chances are that he will never again see his son. He is half blind and suffering from multiple sclerosis. Fortunately, his wife, Inna, a retired pediatrician, is able to care for this bedridden man.

In 1973 Ilya retired from his job as a radio engineer because of failing health. He and his family applied for an exit visa to Israel but were refused because Ilya had previous access to "classified" material. Although their son was allowed to leave the Soviet Union, Ilya and Inna have been denied exit visas repeatedly since 1974.

We have been hearing a lot lately about Mr. Gorbachev and his new policy—glasnost. But, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that there are over 400,000 people seeking to leave the Soviet Union. People like Ilya and Inna who only want what we as Americans have every day—their freedom and the right to worship and be with their family.

Today's Jewish exodus is encouraging—I pray it continues. But the fact remains that aside from a few highly publicized releases, only 244 Soviet Jews have been allowed to leave the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if Mr. Gorbachev is serious about his glasnost policy he must allow more Soviet Jews to emigrate.

For our part we must continue to show our support for the Refusenik's and other Soviet citizens who long for freedom. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that one day Ilya and Inna will be free.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, Congresswoman MORELLA, and those who have joined with her in calling for this special order to focus attention on the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

This week two Western Jewish leaders are meeting with Soviet officials in Moscow in an attempt to open talks that could lead to direct flights for Soviet Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel in return for easing American trade sanctions on the Soviet Union. The success of these talks could significantly improve the ability of Soviet Jews to exercise their human right to emigrate.

About 450 Jews are expected to leave the Soviet Union this month, compared to only 98 in January and 146 in February. While these figures are still far below the peak year in 1979 when 51,000 Jews were allowed to emigrate, it is an encouraging sign.

Mr. Speaker, with many of my colleagues and with leaders of the Jewish community, I welcome these indications of improvement with cautious optimism.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that flagrant violations of human rights continue in the Soviet Union. I am concerned when someone like Vladimir Slepak—one of the founding members of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement—is refused permission to leave the Soviet Union. Thanks to Mr. Slepak's efforts some 260,000 Jews have been permitted to emigrate, but he has not yet received permission to leave.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned because of the violation of the human rights of Mikhail Shirman. Mikhail who emigrated to Israel in 1980 died of leukemia on March 4. A potentially life-saving operation was delayed by the Soviet Union's refusal to let his sister, Inessa Fleurov, donate bone marrow for him until it was too late.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because of mixed signals affecting Soviet policy regarding refuseniks and prisoners of conscience. Earlier Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennady Gerasimov contradicted a statement by Communist Party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev about the time limits required before individuals involved in classified work will be permitted to emigrate. In 1985, Secretary Gorbachev stated that the time limit was generally 5 years and that the very upper limit was 10 years.

Mr. Gerasimov said Secretary Gorbachev's statement "was a mistake." He went on to say that there were categories of state secrets which could not be limited, and were therefore indefinite. "There are institutions in our country where even 30 years of security classification could be inadequate," he said. He then went on to state that refusenik Naum Meiman would never be allowed to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, this inconsistent and arbitrary policy denies to citizens of the Soviet Union human rights which their government has pledged to guarantee. It is imperative that Soviet Jews, Christians, Moslems, and people of all religions be entitled to their right to emigrate if they wish. They should also be permitted to exercise their right to freely practice their religion if they so desire.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that, "recognition of the inherent dignity of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." Mr. Speaker, if the Soviet Union cannot keep this solemn obligation which it has pledged to observe, how can we expect that the Soviet Union will observe other international obligations that it has or may yet enter into?

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will come to realize the crucial importance of the observance of human rights, including the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate or freely to practice their religion if they remain in their country. Human rights is the foundation of good relations between our two nations.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues, Congressman JON KYL and Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA for scheduling this special order today on the continuing plight of Soviet Jews and other minorities.

Recently it was announced that the Soviets have begun to allow 100 Jews per week to leave the Soviet Union. If this trend continues we may see a total of 5,000 Jews emigrate this year, a far cry from the 51,000 of 1979. Many are encouraged that a mass exodus may occur; there is talk of direct flights for Soviet Jews to Israel from the Eastern bloc; there is talk of a new openness in Soviet society that has seen the release of several political prisoners and signs that more may be released soon.

But the harsh reality remains. Alex Slepak, the son of Vladimir and Maria Slepak, is on a hunger strike on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol to draw attention to the fact that the Soviets have announced that his parents are one of eight families who will never leave the Soviet Union;

Leon Charney began a vigil last week outside the gates of the Soviet Embassy to focus attention on the perilous condition of his brother, Benjamin, who is suffering from cancer;

Elena Balovlenkov, a resident of Baltimore, met with Soviet officials on Sunday, March 29 to discuss the continued refusal by the Soviets to allow her husband, Yuri, to join her and their two children in the United States;

Adir Aronovich of Silver Spring, MD wonders if he will ever see his aunt, Sheina-Lea Swartz alive. She suffers from cancer and the Soviets refuse to permit her to travel to the West for medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the list is tragically long. The Soviets have published new emigration regulations, yet today we discuss a resolution on this House floor which condemns them for this action, for the end result may be even more restrictive emigration practices.

Humanitarianism, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is all about. The Soviets have signed documents that call upon the signatories to respect the human rights of individuals yet they fail to live up to those agreements. Where is this humanitarianism? The Soviet Government desires and seeks the respect of other nations. Surely, by now, they understand that respect between nations is premised upon the respect that a nation shows its own citizens.

Mr. Porter. Mr. Speaker, I have been actively involved in the mass movement for Soviet human rights since entering the Congress and admit that I am encouraged by the significant changes being proposed by the Soviets. On the emigration front, 450 Soviet Jews are expected to leave in March, compared to 76 per month in 1986. For the first time, the Soviets have invited to Moscow a senior figure in the American movement for Soviet Jewry, Morris B. Abram. As a result of his extensive talks with Soviet officials, Abram predicts substantial increases in emigration and in Jewish religious and cultural freedom for those choosing to remain in the Soviet Union. From personal experience, I know that the Soviet Embassy is now opening their gates to U.S. officials who come to discuss human rights concerns.

At the same time, we must not be blinded by these changes. They are a step in the right direction but not a solution to the broader problems. Even if 500 Jews are allowed to leave each month, it would take almost 2 years for the 11,000 current refuseniks—those whose previous applications to leave have been rejected—to actually leave. Furthermore, at this rate it would be nearly 70 years before the 400,000 Jews who have expressed a desire to emigrate are allowed to leave. What I'm saying is that 500 a month are far better than 76 but not nearly enough.

Mr. Gorbachev is taking a risk, and the Soviet hardliners are closely watching the outcome. We want to encourage Mr. Gorbachev's apparently more liberal emigration poli-



cies and must be prepared to be more forthcoming in our relations with the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been instrumental in keeping the issue of Soviet human rights in the forefront of United States-Soviet relations. And we must keep it there until every person who wants to leave the Soviet Union has left. We should encourage the changes in the Soviet approaches, but we must never be still and never rest until every person seeking human freedom has been allowed to leave.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, CONNIE MORELLA from Maryland, JOHN KYL from Arizona, and JOHN LEWIS from Georgia for having this special order and for keeping the issue of Soviet Jews in the forefront of our concerns in this House.

As the freshman cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Soviet Jewry last year, I am pleased to see that the freshman Members of the 100th Congress are taking a very active role in behalf of Soviet Jews.

Despite the new glasnost policy of the Soviet Government, the fact remains that at the very least there are some 40,000 Jewish refuseniks who have been waiting years and years for their exit visas.

Will this be the year that the Soviet Government accepts its responsibility to uphold human rights under the Helsinki accords? This remains to be seen.

We are told that some 10,000 cases are under review and that by year's end, some 10,000 refuseniks will be given their exit visas. This, too, remains to be seen.

What we do know is that in January of this year, only 98 refuseniks were granted permission to emigrate to their homeland. In February there was only a slight increase to 146.

In light of Soviet promises and the contrasting reality of the situation, it is clear that there is an important role for Members of Congress to play. We must keep the pressure on.

We can do this in a number of ways. We can:

Adopt a refusenik family and advocate in their behalf with Soviet officials;

Get to know our family personally and share their story with Members of this House and with our constituencies;

Arrange for a trip to the Soviet Union and see the reality first hand;

Participate in the efforts of our colleagues to advocate in behalf of individual refuseniks.

Through these actions, refusenik families may be afforded special protection from harassment and fear which so many encounter when they apply to leave the Soviet Union. It is important for the Soviets to know that we are watching and that we will record publicly their actions.

In addition, we must keep the issue alive as a No. 1 priority in negotiations with the Soviet Union. President Reagan and Secretary Shultz have consistently supported human rights as an integral part of any arms agreement with the Soviets. We should support President Reagan's conviction in this matter.

Finally, a few words for the freshman Members of Congress who have initiated this special order. Your actions here today are vital to the thousands of Soviet Jews who do not have a voice of their own. They depend on us to speak for them to the rest of the world.

Your involvement and your dedication provide great hope to those who must remain in the Soviet Union. When I traveled to Moscow last year, this was the one message given to me time and time again: Please don't let people forget. With your involvement, I am confident that we will not forget.

I encourage all your freshman colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to join in united support for Soviet Jews and to join as members of the Congressional Caucus on Soviet Jewry.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent changes in the Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev, the Jewish people of the Soviet Union are still a people persecuted for their religious beliefs. I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the case of one family, the Slepak family of Moscow.

Vladimir and Maria Slepak are considered founders of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. The Slepaks first applied for exit visas 17 years ago. In addition to seeking exit visas for his own family, Vladimir was a member of the Public Group to Assist the fulfillment of the Helsinki Accords in the U.S.S.R. For his defense of human rights Vladimir's apartment was repeatedly raided, his books confiscated, and his name vilified throughout the Soviet press.

Vladimir was arrested twice in 1971 and was forced to testify at the Second Leningrad Trials of 1971. In 1978, Vladimir was sentenced to 5 years of internal exile in Siberia for hanging a sign from his apartment window pleading for the right to join his sons in Israel.

Today, as we meet, Vladimir's son Alexander is staging a hunger strike in front of the Capitol. Alexander Slepak, a constituent of mine, is a husband, father, and medical student. He is making this courageous stand to demonstrate the cruelty of the Soviet system that has kept him separated from his parents for these many years. The strike will last for 17 days, 1 day for each year that his parents have been denied the right to emigrate. I urge my colleagues to support Alexander in his strike to gain his parents' freedom.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with other Members of Congress in expressing our support for House Concurrent Resolution 34, which protests continued human rights violations in the Soviet Union. Passage of this resolution reaffirms Congress' commitment to the plight of the Soviet refuseniks and its continued concern that the U.S.S.R. must adhere to its responsibilities under the Helsinki accords and other treaties.

In the recent past we have heard some good news from the Soviet Union in the context of its new glasnost or openness policy. Just yesterday Morris Abram, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, made some promising predictions about the possibility of emigration for the estimated 11,000 refuseniks living in the Soviet Union. After taking part in a series of high level meetings, Mr. Abram anticipates some important policy shifts in emigration. Most encouraging of all is that about 500 Jews received exit visas this month. This is five times the monthly rate of last year.

Yet despite this progress, the situation for Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate remains grim. Two weeks ago I met with a group of

people from Kansas City who came to Washington to express their continued support for the Soviet Jews and to bring to my attention a number of specific individuals who still need our help. Listed below are the names of these refuseniks.

I commend the efforts of these active individuals in Kansas City and others around the country, including many in my home community of Wichita, who have made it their duty to remember these people. I urge my colleagues to continue to show that same dedication to the plight of the Soviet refuseniks.

Luavick, Sofie and Marina Vigdarov, Leonid Levit, Lvov.

Stanislav Mezhebovsky, Leningrad.

Evgeny Yakir, Moscow.

Yuri Frants, Moscow.

Vladimir Gorodnitsky, Leningrad.

Vyachslav Livshits, Moscow.

Yangil Manashirov, Derbent.

Iosif Pargamanik, Kiev.

Jacob Rabinovich, Leningrad.

Gennady Resnikov, Moscow.

Leonid Ruskin, Leningrad.

David Shekhter, Odessa.

Viktor Shtein, Moscow.

Alexander Solomadin, Moscow.

Grigory Vainer, Volgograd.

Leonid Yuzefovich, Moscow.

Leonid Doks, Vinnitsa.

Mikhail Kara-Ivanov, Moscow.

Boris Kelman, Leningrad.

Sergei Ksido, Leningrad.

Naum Koleminsky, Kolomyia.

Andrei Lifshitz, Moscow.

Grigory Marantz, Leningrad.

Igor Mazo, Leningrad.

Vladimir Mitin, Riga.

Natalia Sofronov, Kharkov.

Valery Sorin, Moscow.

Vadim Teter, Soviet Armenia.

Mengert Berner, Zakarpatskaya Oblast.

Ian Brushin, Leningrad.

Boris Edelman, Leningrad.

Michael Jacobson, Moscow.

Aron Khananaev, Derbent.

Lev Kitrossky, Moscow.

Evgeny Lizunov, Kiev.

Yura Miller, Moscow.

Sergey Pyshuy, Leningrad.

Mark Rakovsky, Kharkov.

Mark Tarshis, Moscow.

Vitaly Degtyarev, Yanna Berenshtein,

Moscow.

Albert Burshtein, Leningrad.

Marina Vigdarov, Moscow.

Mikhail Faingersh, Kishinev.

Adolph Raikh, Khust.

Viktor Brailovsky, Moscow.

Efim Pitovsky, Kharkov.

Aron & Yakov Ibragimov, Tashkent.

Abram Benenson, Leningrad.

David Kroiter, Kishinev.

Stanislav Glinkene, Kaunas.

Aleksandr Lukatsky, Moscow.

Solomon Lekhtman, Beltsky.

Zhanna Volynskaya, Moscow.

Kuuh Avadiale, Derbent.

Iosip Iosovich, Khust.

Boris Lisenker, Chernovtsy.

Lev Shapiro, Leningrad.

Mark Lvovsky, Moscow.

Iosif Aunutzky, Kharkov.

Solomon Finkelshtein, Chernovtsy.

David Kvartin, Moscow.

Yakov Ioffe, Leningrad.

Anatoly Shavlov, Grozny.

Galina Molchanova, Kiev.

Leonid Volvovsky, Gorky.

Volko Rabiner, Kiev.

Igor Abkevitch, Moscow.

Zinoviy Fuks, Odessa.  
 Evgeny Alzenberg, Kharkov.  
 Vladimir Berkun, Donetsk.  
 Mark Freidlin, Moscow.  
 Boris Friedman, Leningrad.  
 Clara Galant, Odessa.  
 Boris Ger, Leningrad.  
 Gregory Gimpelson, Leningrad.  
 Aleksander Kan, Moscow.  
 Mark Katz, Leningrad.  
 Efim Lifson, Leningrad.  
 Isaak Maizlin, Moscow.  
 Arkady Pittel, Leningrad.  
 Michael Fuchs Rabinovich, Moscow.  
 Moisey Liberman, Bendery.  
 Michael Mermershtein, Zakarpatsia.  
 Naum Rabinovich, Zaporozhie.  
 Marina Raikhlin, Moscow.  
 Michael Schmidt, Leningrad.  
 Lev Shubov, Leningrad.  
 Yakov Volokh, Vinnitsa.  
 Leonid Altman, Tashkent.  
 Yuri Varvak, Kiev.  
 Elisaveta Kelbert, Leningrad.  
 Elena Goldfarb, Moscow.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, after a full year of Soviet glasnost, the 1986 emigration total for Soviet Jews stood at 914. That dismal total is the second lowest in the 1980's, and lower than an average 1-month total in the 1970's. The much heralded policy of glasnost obviously didn't have a positive impact on Jewish emigration. Glasnost means openness, but openness to the Soviets does not refer to open borders for Soviet Jews.

It is long past time for the Soviet Union to recognize that respect for human rights means more than merely signing an accord or talking about openness. If Mr. Gorbachev has been practicing openness he knows that there has been no end to the number of Congressional letters protesting the Soviet Union's perpetual, cruel treatment of Jews, ethnic minorities, prisoners of conscience, religious groups, and any others who don't fit into their oppressive system. We never receive any replies to our letters, but written replies would be like the ink on the paper of the Helsinki Final Act—mere words. Action is what counts.

Despite the substantial disappointments of 1986, there was, nevertheless, hope that 1987 would be better. The ponderous Soviet bureaucracy, accustomed to dealing out repression, moves slowly when the direction is toward freedom. But as of today it is apparent that long-awaited improvements may finally be on the way.

Morris B. Abram, president of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Edgar M. Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress, just completed talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow. The results are very promising, especially in the light of the increase in Soviet Jewish emigres this month. Along with the possible easing of restrictions on Jewish religious observances, the Soviets gave assurances that they would permit a major increase in Jewish emigration.

We all know that the Soviets are masters at saying one thing and doing another. Now it is time for their deeds to match their rhetoric. The latest figures show that 453 Soviet Jews were able to emigrate in March, which is the highest 1-month total since July 1981. Some 500 Jews were granted permission to emigrate in March, and I am pleased to hear that among those granted permission are Mikhail

and Marina Fuks-Rabinovich and their son Mishka. I'll be even more pleased when I hear they have their exit visas and are on their way out. When we add it all up, in the first 3 months of 1987, 697 Soviet Jews were able to emigrate. That is a positive development.

I don't mean to imply any satisfaction with the numbers of Soviet Jewish emigres. Far from it. Everyone here remembers that thousands of Soviet Jews emigrated each month in the 1970's. What encouragement we take from the recent increase is only the hope that it represents a reversal of the decline of the past 7 years. For every Jew permitted to leave, over 100 more remain behind. How can we be satisfied when only 1 percent of the 400,000 Jews who seek their freedom are allowed to achieve it? We can't—and we aren't.

We are not satisfied as long as Lev and Inna Elbert are forced by repressive Soviet policy to continue their hunger strike, while the Kremlin sits in stone-faced silence, unmoved by compassion or humanity. We are not satisfied as long as Benjamin Charney suffers the dual hardship of inadequate medical care and refusal, while his son Leon sits in daily protest outside the Soviet Embassy. We are not satisfied, Mr. Gorbachev, and we will not be satisfied until Vladimir and Maria Slepak, Abe Stolar, Boris Dorodny, and the thousands of other refuseniks and Jews who wish to leave are granted their freedom.

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in recent weeks about the Soviet Union's "new" policy of glasnost, or openness, regarding its dealings with both its citizens and other nations of the world. However, upon closer inspection, one will find that this new policy consists more of empty rhetoric than actual deeds.

True, there have been some families who have been allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the free world, and for that, we are grateful. But the happy ending for these families are but small victories . . . victories that are overshadowed by the thousands and thousands of individuals whose happy endings have yet to be written and whose dreams remain unfulfilled.

During the first two months of 1987, and following the implementation of the new emigration law on January 1, only 244 Soviet Jews were allowed to leave. This is not a significant improvement over the number of Soviet Jews who were allowed to leave during 1985 and 1986. In fact, almost 400,000 Jews continue to be denied the right to be with their loved ones and practice their religious beliefs.

Since my election to Congress in 1983, I have tried to secure the release of several families who sought to emigrate from the Soviet Union. One of those families, Boris and Irene Ghinis, was finally allowed to emigrate last year and arrived in the United States several months ago after more than 8 years of struggle.

I recently received a letter from the Ghinis, in which they wrote, "At this moment of our happiness we cannot forget about many of our friends, who have been struggling for many years for free emigration from the Soviet Union." They have asked me to help secure the release of three families in particular, Alexander and Irina Berdichevski, who have been trying to emigrate since 1982, the

Yusephoviches, who have been refuseniks since 1980, and the Shustoroviches, who have sought the right to emigrate since 1977.

I have taken up the cause of these three families, and have added them to the group of families I continue to fight for, the Mikhail Kazanovich family, the Antanas Vausa family, and the family of Nachman Komack.

As we continue to fight for the rights of Soviet Jews and people around the world who live under oppressive states, it is imperative that we impress upon Soviet leaders that we have not been duped by their claims of glasnost, and that countries with true policies of openness place a higher regard on the rights of the individual, not the iron will of the government.

Steady and constant pressure can move a seemingly immovable object. Let us take courage from the infinite strength and unflagging faith of those who seek freedom, and redouble our efforts on behalf of the thousands in the Soviet Union who ask no more than the right to exercise their religious freedom, emigrate, and be reunited with their families.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Maryland for her special order concerning the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. Ever since Stalin tried to destroy the identity of Jews in the U.S.S.R. by dismantling the Jewish educational system, destroying Jewish communal and cultural institutions, and restricting Jewish religious practices, it has been clear that the road to freedom for Jews in the Soviet Union will be an especially arduous and difficult one.

Of the thousands of Jews that wish to emigrate to Israel or to the West, only a small group are granted this basic request every year. From the day a Soviet Jew applies for emigration to the day of departure, months or years may pass. The long emigration process may be marked by constant harassment and conscious bureaucratic delays, especially for activists. To apply, one must submit a variety of documents to the local visa office. The critical one is a vyzov, or invitation from a relative in Israel. Since 1979, narrow rules determined that this invitation must be from "first degree" kin, virtually precluding hundreds of thousands of people from receiving the mandatory document to apply for an exit visa.

Those persistent to apply for exit visas even after they have been denied permission on previous occasions are then labeled "refuseniks." Refuseniks and their families are subject to special harassment and great suffering. Among the forms employed are repeated questioning by the authorities, firing people and forcing them into menial jobs, expelling them from universities and professional institutions, and, in some cases, revoking their academic or professional credentials.

For those Soviet Jews who wish to try and make changes within the U.S.S.R., they confront many of the same obstacles as those who wish to leave. Since 1970, Soviet authorities have tried to curb Jewish activism. Arrests and trials of selected individuals took place, and scores of Jews were sentenced to prison, forced labor camps, and were exiled to Siberia. Instead of deterring Soviet Jews, however, the plights of these "prisoners of conscience"



have served to intensify the determination of Jewish activists to carry on the struggle.

Earlier today, the House of Representatives passed a resolution which I cosponsored that makes support for the restoration of internationally recognized human rights in the U.S.S.R. a priority for the 100th Congress, and strongly protests continued Soviet violation and the new emigration regulations. Although it was only a resolution, it further confirms congressional concern over the human rights and emigration abuses perpetrated by the Soviet Union. Hopefully, continued pressure might someday bring about a positive change in the treatment of Jews in the U.S.S.R.

Once again, I commend the gentlewoman from Maryland for her efforts.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those in Congress who are protesting the continued persecution and mistreatment of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

The religious freedom that is taken for granted in America is nonexistent, for the Jewish people at least, in the Soviet Union. They are not free to worship as they please, as we are. They are not free to instruct their children in the tenets of their religion, as we are. In short, the Jews of the Soviet Union are denied every means to preserve their Judaism and its rich and illustrious heritage.

In light of this situation, we must consider these recent developments. The Soviets have spoken in recent days of the policy of glasnost, openness, of supposedly alleviating the brutal conditions that confront Soviet Jews and other oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union. Now, we hear of a prominent Jewish leader predicting that the Soviet Union will permit thousands of Jews to emigrate to Israel this year, and that Jewish religious and cultural freedom will be substantially increased for those who choose to stay in the Soviet Union. What are we to make of these events?

As of today, glasnost has not meant much for the oppressed Jews of the Soviet Union. In the first 2 months of 1987, only 287 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. There are still 400,000 Jews waiting the emigrate from the Soviet Union. For those who choose to practice their Judaism in the Soviet Union, conditions still remain pretty grim. We have yet to hear of the Soviet authorities allowing the teaching of Hebrew to children in schools or synagogues, yet to see increased training of rabbis for the Jews of the Soviet Union, and yet to learn of synagogues being opened in all parts of the Soviet Union where they are needed.

The recent predictions of permission for Jews to emigrate by the thousands and for the revitalization of Judaism by the Soviet authorities must be received with cautious optimism. We must await Soviet performance on these actions, to see if they are truly serious about implementing the policy of glasnost.

Mr. Speaker, the behavior of the Soviet authorities toward the Jews of the Soviet Union has certainly caused persecution and hardship to the millions of the Jewish people who live there. It is time that they lived up to the guarantees of religious freedom found in the Soviet Constitution, and endorsed by the Soviet leaders when they signed the Helsinki Declaration on Human Rights. We can only hope and pray that the predictions of freedom

for the Jews of the Soviet Union are true, and that these oppressed and persecuted people, along with other Soviet peoples, will finally taste the joys of religious freedom and tolerance.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in the special order bringing to light the problems suffered by Soviet Jewry despite the recent glasnost in the Soviet Union. We cannot allow our efforts on the behalf of Jews in the Soviet Union to lessen. While this recent change in Soviet policy does hold the potential for reforming, in some measurable way, the Soviet political and economic system, it can hardly be termed a decisive turning point when the basic human rights of thousands of Soviet Jews to emigrate are being denied.

We applaud the release of some 140 dissidents from Soviet gulags. We cannot forget, however, that these recent internal reforms have been accomplished by a severe tightening of eligibility standards for approval of applications to emigrate.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the case of the Tsimberov family of Leningrad, Pavel and Victoria Tsimberov, their 21-year-old daughter Una, their 24-year-old son Dmitri, Dmitri's wife Tania and their 6-month-old baby Leah have applied for permission to leave the Soviet Union for the United States. The original application was filed 8 years ago and has been consistently denied.

Pavel is a physicist who lost his job when the original application was filed and is now working as a sewer inspector. Dmitri and his wife are both doctors. He has been offered a scholarship at the Harvard Medical School. Una has been offered a fellowship at the Eastman School of Music in Rochester. The family has close friends in Rochester, NY, and they are all fluent in English.

It is a shame that these people and others like them are not allowed to emigrate and begin more productive lives. I have been endeavoring to obtain the Tsimberovs' freedom, but we all know it will be a long and difficult effort.

Since the implementation of the new Soviet emigration law on January 1, only 244 Soviet Jews have been allowed to leave. This is not a significant improvement over the previous 2 years. The fact remains that over 400,000 Jews are still waiting to emigrate. We cannot allow the recent glasnost to make us lose sight of this grim statistic.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues in continuing our efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry. In spite of the public position adopted by General-Secretary Gorbachev, the situation in the Soviet Union has not changed for hundreds of thousands of Jewish citizens and members of other ethnic groups who wish to exercise their right to emigrate. The recent publicity coup for the Soviets aired on a CBS "60 Minutes" broadcast must be scrutinized in the same manner we have to review every other official Soviet statement.

Mr. Gorbachev is simply following in the footsteps of many of his predecessors in using human beings as political capital. He simply doles out a few visas and hopes that the world will forget his rosy promises to increase Jewish emigration.

Those who wish to leave the Soviet Union are then bogged down in a hopeless entanglement. If they have ever worked for the Soviet Government, a strong possibility given the degree of government economic control, the potential emigre faces the infamous "state secret" barrier. Whether they have knowledge from college science experiments or the Moscow sewer system, they possess "state secrets," and their visa applications are denied.

The story does not end at that point for the unfortunate Soviet Jew, who has stated his desire to leave. His or her job is suddenly terminated, and with no realistic hope for employment, the individual is left with no resources. The next step toward a life of misery and oppression is the routine harassment by KGB agents and eventual arrest for partisanship, the crime of not having a job.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans simply do not know or do not believe the incredible brutality of the Soviet system. They disregard the stories of families divided for years, deaths and illnesses in prison camps, and other instances of official oppression.

Our efforts to publicize these ongoing atrocities have been set back by a carefully contrived media event staged by the Soviet Government. We cannot allow "60 Minutes" or any other journalistic endeavor to cover up the real Soviet policies.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus attention on the Soviet Union's dismal human rights record. I want to focus particularly on the U.S.S.R.'s repression of Soviet Jews. Each of us knows several cases where Soviet authorities have denied internationally recognized human rights to people whose only crimes are to want to learn their own language and culture, to teach their religion, and to emigrate.

Recently, an article in the New York Times quoted Soviet officials as predicting that 10,000 to 12,000 Jews would leave the Soviet Union this year. I hope this prediction comes true because Soviet authorities have to date been very stingy with exit visas, which are required of Soviet Jews who want to leave the country. These people want to leave because they are consistently discriminated against not only as a religious group but also as a national group. For example, they are not permitted to study their own history, culture, and language. They are arrested for the crime of teaching Hebrew and for the dissemination of Jewish culture. Soviet Jews applying for exit visas are arrested, charged with having committed "crimes against the state," put in prison for "leading a parasitic way of life," and are generally mistreated and harassed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the basis for the Soviet prediction of such a high level of Jewish emigration this year, but I do know that Soviet authorities have consistently looked for ways to make emigration ever more difficult. The new Soviet emigration law, for example, stipulates that invitations from immediate relatives, such as a spouse or a parent, are the only basis for granting an exit visa. Under the old law, which was restrictive enough, applicants for exit visas were required to obtain invitations from relatives abroad, including distant relatives, before being considered.

Mr. Speaker, simply on the basis of the new emigration law it would seem unlikely that Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union this year would rise. Jewish emigration reached its peak in 1979 with the departure of 51,000 Soviet Jews. Under the old law, departures dwindled to less than 1 percent of that number. Why should we believe that the more restrictive new law will permit a larger number of the 400,000 Jews who want to leave to obtain an exit visa?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to take every opportunity to protest in strongest terms the Soviet Union's violations of human rights. I believe this can be done by exposing individual cases of oppression and mistreatment. Anatoly Shcharansky recently told an American audience that focusing attention on particular cases of mistreatment can make a life-and-death difference. I believe this to be true.

One case that everyone may be aware of is that of Ida Nudel, a former prisoner of conscience and current refusenik. Nudel was convicted in 1978 on charges of "malicious hooliganism" and was sentenced to internal exile in Siberia for hanging a sign on her balcony saying, "KGB, give me my visa." She was released in 1982 and now lives in rural Moldavia. She has applied for, and has so far been refused, and exit visa to emigrate to Israel. I have worn an Ida Nudel bracelet since 1980, and I will continue to wear it until Ida Nudel is allowed to leave the Soviet Union for the freedom of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to focus on the plight of Soviet Jews and to undertake everything possible to ensure their safety. I also urge my colleagues to put all the necessary pressure on Moscow to allow those who want to leave the U.S.S.R. to do so without harassment. We are beginning to see some success. If we continue to act together on this, I believe we can do much for those everywhere who are oppressed and who need our help to free them from their shackles.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, suffering is not something new for Jews. Problems, faced by Jews in the Soviet Union, is especially not new. Acts of anti-Semitism have been prevalent throughout the history of Russia. Indeed, was the wrath of the pogroms that first brought thousands upon thousands of Russian Jews to this country at the turn of the century.

Certainly, things have improved since the time of Cossacks slaughtering whole towns and burning down synagogues while human beings remained locked inside.

Life in the Soviet Union, however, is still not good for Jews. A new leader with a clever public relations cadre and a catchy ad campaign does not change basic policy. Despite the vaunted glasnost, repression continues in its most brutal and inhumane forms.

Recently, the CBS television series "60 Minutes" portrayed the plight of Soviet Jewry in an inaccurate light, seriously hurting the cause of fighters for justice. I feel compelled to read to you the letter sent to Mike Wallace by Pamela Cohen, national president of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry, an organization of over 77,000 members who have fought for the cause of Soviet Jewry for more than a decade.

[Letter]

DEAR MIKE WALLACE: I found your 60 Minute segment of March 22, which purported to examine fairly the situation of Soviet Jews, to be dangerously misleading. By irresponsibly distorting the balance of easily available witnesses, it gave the Soviet Union an undeserved propaganda victory against the human rights movement that mocks the direct evidence our network of rescue workers collects every day. In so doing, you may have caused irreparable harm to the aspirations of refuseniks who put their lives on the line simply by seeking freedom.

By what standards of research and accuracy could you balance a single Jewish refusenik with a long parade of English-speaking court Jews, e.g., a Soviet "Frank Sinatra", a Russian "George Burns", a viciously anti-Semitic Samuel Ziv, an English teacher who denies the indisputable trend of Jews wishing to learn and speak Hebrew even when Hebrew teachers are routinely arrested, harassed and sent to jail, a class of smug, British accented students, as if the Soviets don't discriminate against Jews applying to university, and as if Jewish children are not generally ostracized and vilified by their schoolmates?

Could CBS not afford a proper translator of its own? Where were the Russian activists, the hunger and labor strikers, of the Jewish refusenik movement? Where were the dozens of current and former prisoners of conscience? How obscene to trot out to the Potemkin village of Birobidzhain. Have you forgotten Thieriesenstadt? By whose authority do you claim that "1.5 million Soviet Jews live more or less satisfying lives" in the face of state-sponsored anti-Semitism and the nearly 50,000 refuseniks who have risked all for the legal right to emigrate to a land of their choice, to say nothing of the 400,000 who are known to want desperately to leave the USSR? Is it the eyewitness testimony of the Sharanskys, Orov, and Sakharovs to be discredited by a few smiling, ironic faces tolerated by the KGB?

We of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, the 77,000-member rescue organization, offered your producers our assistance in finding truly representative refuseniks and prisoner families to interview. Contrary to your statement, this has never been hard to do even in the worst periods of repression. I repeat the offer today. Indeed, I seriously urge you to let us help you repair some of the grievous damage you have done to the fragile cause of rescue. I urge you to give us equal time by scheduling another, blacker side of the story.

Your program did dangerous disservice by letting entertainment values masquerade as news and comment. Surely, CBS News is capable of a competent, careful, and well researched presentation of the plight of Soviet Jews.

Sincerely,

PAMELA COHEN,  
National President,  
Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry.

None of us should be a stranger to the harsh realities of the refusenik. Day after day, applications for emigration by Soviet Jews are rejected. The violations of the Helsinki accords have become the most predictable part of Soviet policy.

Jail, torture, and slow death are the punishments for such crimes as teaching a language of faith, passing on a heritage, and wanting to

move to a society where such freedoms are considered normal.

"60 Minutes" may doubt these facts, but I have had them once again confirmed by one of my former legislative assistants, Ron Apter, who visited first hand with Soviet refuseniks just 2 weeks ago.

Meeting with these families on my behalf, Mr. Apter noted the cruel tests that become a way of life for these people. Prison, forced labor, brutal hunger strikes, and dangerous army assignments become routine.

"60 Minutes" seemed short on examples. Yet, there are more than 10,000 documented cases. I will mention only a few.

Yuri Drookinov, and Vitaly Nikolayevich Efimov have become statistics. They are two of 400,000 who wish to emigrate. They are two of 10,000 who have been actively persecuted for expressing their desire for freedom. Both Yuri and Vitaly have family members in my home State of Minnesota people who have written to me of the frustration and the suffering shared by these two individuals.

Anatoli Raben and Janna Saguta are people whose names were brought to my special attention by Inna Meiman. Inna Meiman was a refusenik that the Soviet Union was only willing to let emigrate when her painful cancer was so severe that death was imminent. Inna Meiman died here in Washington shortly after her release. Her experience with freedom was tragically short. Her husband, Naum, still awaits any experience with freedom.

Boris Lifshits, an 18-year-old boy waits in a hospital bed. The torture brought to him as military duty included 16 hours a day of strenuous manual labor on almost no food. My former aid visited Boris' family in Leningrad shortly after they got word that Boris' father would be released from a Soviet prison. The scene that he described to me is one of intense emotion.

There are so many names, so many stories, so much suffering.

Leaders of the Soviet Union:

Let your nation be known amongst to nations as one with a just society, and a fair and compassionate people. I know that as I speak you have the power to release thousands. The choice is in your hands. This month you have already decided to release more than 5 hundred souls. I know that you are considering the release of thousands and thousands more.

Mr. Gorbachev, Members of the Politburo: Let these people go.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank our new colleagues, Representatives MORELLA and KYL, for organizing this special order on Soviet Jewry.

This special order comes at a particularly appropriate time. The Jewish holiday of Passover—a commemoration of the Jews exodus from Egypt and slavery—is just 2 weeks away and the news from the Soviet Union is the most encouraging it has been in 7 years. Rumor has it that as a result of the new glasnost policy 400 visas will have been issued to Soviet Jews this month alone and this morning's paper carried a prediction of mass exodus over the next year.



Any yet a nagging doubt keeps us from celebrating these new developments. It was just 2 months ago that Inna Meiman died because the Soviets prevented her from coming here for desperately needed medical treatments until it was too late. I still receive letters from constituents whose mother or brother or friend are not allowed to leave to join their only surviving relatives or to return to the land of their people in Israel. We still hear of refuseniks who have been turned down for visas and told not to reapply because they will never be allowed to leave. Despite all of the releases of prisoners of conscience, Iosif Berenshtein, Aleksandr Cherniak, Yuli Edelshtein, and Aleksey Magarik still remain in labor camps and are subject to inhumane treatment and brutal beatings. Ida Nudel, the Guardian Angel of Refuseniks, is still in internal exile and kept from her ever vigilant sister in Israel.

We do continue to hope, even if it is a cautious hope. I hope that this year Semyon Gluzman, a psychiatrist and former prisoner of conscience whom I first adopted 8 years ago, will be allowed to leave; that this year, Soviet Jews will be allowed to practice their religion and learn Hebrew without harassment; that this year, when Soviet Jews say at their Passover Seders "Next year in Jerusalem," it will be a reality and not a dream.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out once again on behalf of human rights in the Soviet Union and, in particular Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are following with great interest recent development in the U.S.S.R. It appears as though General Secretary Gorbachev has taken some first steps toward improving human rights in the Soviet Union. A number of political prisoners and prisoners of conscience have been released from the Gulag. Emigration figures are up somewhat from the dismal rates last year. In today's Washington Post Morris Abrams, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, notes his optimism about possible major changes in Soviet policy toward the Jewish minority there, following his discussions with Mr. Gorbachev.

I know all of my colleagues here, and all people who cherish liberty, hope this is so. But while the Soviets have released scores of prisoners of conscience and political prisoners from prison camps, thousands are said to remain. While Iosif Begun, Leonid Volvovsky, Roald Zelichonok, and others have been released, Yuli Edelshtein and Alexei Magarik are still subjected to forced labor and severe deprivation. While it is hinted that some 11,000 long-term refuseniks may soon be allowed to emigrate, there is no talk of reworking the wholly inadequate Decree on Emigration to allow hundreds of thousands of others to leave.

Moreover, questions about national security restrictions on the emigration rights of some refuseniks cause grave concern. Just last month the Soviets announced that eight refuseniks—Vladimir Slepak, Alexander Lerner, Yulian Khasin, Natalya Khasina, Yuli Kosharovskiy, Yaacov Rakhlenko, Valery Soifer, and Lev Sud—will not be allowed to emigrate because of their access to "government secrets."

Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the specifics of each of these cases, but I do know about the case of Vladimir Slepak. I met Vladimir during my trip to the Soviet Union in October 1985 and his son Alexander resides in the Philadelphia area.

Vladimir and his wife, Mariya, have been trying to emigrate for some 17 years, but have been refused because of Vladimir's supposed access to Soviet national secrets. His alleged exposure to secrets stems from his work 17 years ago as head of the Moscow Television Research Institute. Despite the fact that his knowledge of Soviet television technology is 17 years old, that such knowledge was only arguably tied to any military matter, and that others who worked with him on the same projects have been allowed to emigrate, he has been listed as ineligible to emigrate. Clearly, the Soviet position on this case is untenable, and it suggests that the other denials are equally supportable.

Last Friday, Vladimir's son Alexander initiated a 17-day hunger strike on behalf of his parents. The 17 days are symbolic of the 17 years of refusal that his parents have endured. The deprivation that Alexander is now inflicting on himself symbolizes the 17 years of deprivation of freedom that his parents have suffered—including periods of exile and imprisonment. When Vladimir learned of his son's plans, he too started a 17-day fast. Alexander is carrying out his hunger strike by the fountains on the east side of the Capitol, and I heartily encourage my colleagues to show their support by visiting with him.

Mr. Speaker, General Secretary Gorbachev may have moved forward a few steps with some of his recent actions. It remains to be seen just how far he will go. What is clear, however, is that the distance he must ultimately travel to dispel all doubts and demonstrate true change is far, far indeed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, I join my distinguished colleagues today in calling on the Soviet Union to put substance into their glasnost policy. I am especially concerned with the continued refusal by the U.S.S.R. to grant an exit visa to Ida Nudel.

For 15 years Ms. Nudel has been seeking an exit visa so that she may join her sister, Ilana Fridman, in Israel. She has assisted other refuseniks and their families. For her efforts, she has been denied an exit visa repeatedly, treated violently, arrested, tried and sentenced to exile in Siberia, where she lived for 4 years. While there, she was beaten and then housed in a barrack lacking electricity, water, and heat at a time when temperatures dropped to 40 degrees below zero.

When Ms. Nudel returned to Moscow, she was not allowed to live in her home. It is often difficult for refuseniks to find a place to stay, so it took her several months to find a place in Bendery, Moldavia.

I am very concerned about the conditions under which Ms. Nudel is living now. Recent reports indicate she has been harassed in her efforts to obtain medical care. Her sister has told us that people are afraid to be her friend and that she is very lonely.

I hope that the Soviet Union will take the humanitarian route and give Ms. Nudel an exit visa soon so that she may be reunited with her family.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the American public has recently become aware of a new trend in Soviet policy known as glasnost or the democratization of Soviet society. Initiated by the Soviet Union's General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, glasnost has been widely hailed as a demonstration of Soviet commitment to human rights and freedom.

In truth, glasnost could prove the most significant threat yet to human rights and freedoms in the Soviet Union. I am concerned that Gorbachev's call for openness may lull us into a false sense of complacency regarding the need for continued action on behalf of the Soviet Jews. I understand that the March figure for Soviet emigration of Jews was the highest monthly figure in 5 years. That is encouraging. However, the 400 visas given out in March are only the tip of the iceberg. We cannot forget that there are hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews still desperately seeking to emigrate.

In addition, we must not forget the persecution and vicious anti-Semitism which prevades Soviet society. Indeed, even now—during this so-called democratization—Hebrew teachers in the U.S.S.R. are routinely arrested, harassed and sent to prison, as are the many prisoners-of-conscience who vigorously protest human rights violations in that country. There are also the refuseniks who are relentlessly persecuted and whose only crime is their sincere desire to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

We must not relax our efforts to secure human rights and freedom for the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union. As long as these individuals are living under such oppression and persecution, glasnost is nothing but an empty promise.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the courage and strife of the people of the Soviet Union who struggle daily to secure their fundamental human rights. I also take this opportunity to urge the Soviet Government to provide an environment where all people, regardless of race or creed may live freely and without fear of persecution.

Recently, much attention has been brought to the new Soviet policy of "glasnost," or openness. I am encouraged by this attitude of reform and tolerance, however, words are not sufficient to bring about change. Human rights must be respected.

Continuing reports of discrimination and imprisonment for political and religious reasons reveal human rights violations in the Soviet Union. Today in Congress we urge the Soviet Union to match that country's theory of openness and cultural freedom with its actions.

As an example of the new cultural and social openness, Soviet leaders cite the 244 Soviet Jews granted permission to emigrate to Israel this year. However, 400,000 Soviet Jews await emigration permission, and hundreds remain imprisoned.

The people of the Soviet Union must be assured their fundamental human rights—their right to life, liberty and personal dignity, including the right to religious and cultural heritage.

Under "glasnost," some jailed dissidents have been released and some divided families have been reunited. The key word here is

some, and not all. Suffering and persecution due to human rights violations persist in the Soviet Union making a call for reform imperative.

The Soviet Union has taken a step in the right direction with its new attitude of "glasnost," and I encourage further efforts both within the Soviet Union and worldwide toward the establishment and upholding of international human rights.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ERDREICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN SPACE: ENHANCING THE WORLD'S COMMON SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months, in a series of special order speeches, I have addressed various aspects of the Nation's space program. On February 26, I provided a detailed analysis of how the Nation's overall space effort has become increasingly controlled by the military, and how it is being diverted toward the goal of developing instruments for space warfare. Today, I will carry my discussion one step further, by exploring security-enhancing alternatives to an arms race in space.

As a starting point, I would like to focus quickly on the concept of national security. Doing so seems only fitting in any discussion of programs aimed at contributing to America's security interests.

Fundamentally, we all have a sense of what national security is. The term implies protection of the Nation from external threats while maintaining the health, integrity and economic well-being of our society. Justifiably, the term could be applied to any number of programs aimed at ensuring the continued vigor and prosperity of America. Practically speaking, however, the term "national security" is generally used in a much more limited fashion.

In its most common usage, national security is the catchall phrase used to defend the need for new weapons systems. A quick search through the annals of this political institution would show the term "national security" affixed to more weapons systems than to any other program or activity. Weapons systems such as the Minute-

man, Pershing, and MX missiles; the B-1, B-52, and Stealth bombers; the Polaris, Poseidon, and Trident submarines; these—and many, many more—have been advanced by the Pentagon and then advocated by politicians as being "essential" in order to maintain the national security of the United States.

Throughout the period of developing and deploying these weapons, however, little attention has been given to whether our investments are actually making us feel more secure. While many argue that our nuclear arsenal has, indeed, brought security benefits, and others argue that it is the Soviet Union's defense buildup that has prevented us from meeting our security objectives, I think most of us realize that the past 40 years of pursuing national security has left us less secure at each new turn of the United States-Soviet arms race.

Despite the hundreds of billions of dollars invested in defense programs year after year, national security remains an illusive goal; indeed, it has become an increasingly unreachable goal as new weapons—once deployed by both superpowers—have simply spawned new insecurities. Increasingly accurate land-based nuclear missiles with multiple warheads, cruise missiles small enough to be carried on any surface vessel, strategic bombers increasingly invisible to radar detection—these developments, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, are not allowing any of us to sleep better at night.

Although people are reluctant to admit it—given the enormous investments we have made in building our nuclear arsenal—we live today in a world which has made traditional notions of security obsolete, in which the continued development and refinement of our nuclear arsenal is simply irrational. Whereas the weapons of yesteryear had limited capabilities and limited implications when used, today, the entire firepower of World War II can be unleashed by a single nuclear bomb. That firepower can be delivered to essentially any spot on the globe in a matter of minutes. And there are enough nuclear weapons in the world to recreate the explosive power of more than 6,000 World War II's.

These weapons of global scale, deliverable in a brutally short timeframe, have forced us into an era in which we simply cannot continue to think according to the conventional terms of national security. Those terms have suggested that a single nation's security can be maintained independent of the security of other nations. We must now think in terms of common security. For we live in a time when U.S. security is inextricably linked to the security of nations around the globe. If world war III comes, regardless of where it starts and who starts it, it

could well determine the fate of all 159 nations on this planet.

All nations thus share the same desire to prevent such a war. All nations face a common threat to their continued survival. This is an unprecedented reality that must be reflected in our security planning.

And it's not simply the nuclear threat that is melding the security of all nations into one. The possibility of environmental crises of global dimensions also has a grasp on the world's collective destiny. A warming up of the atmosphere due to the continued burning of fossil fuels, depletion of the ozone layer as a result of fluorocarbon interactions, changes in the climate due to population stresses on the environment—these and other environmental threats are of real and immediate concern. Within the next 50 to 100 years—a minuscule time period in terms of human history—environmental crises could have devastating impacts on the security of the United States, and the security of nations around the world. Here again, security must be seen in global, and not simply national, terms.

With this said, let me now turn to the space program, which I am convinced could play a vital role in helping the world move away from its outdated, nationalistic notions of security, and toward the fundamental requirements of common security.

At the present time, the Nation's space program, unfortunately, is being carried by the currents of thought that have dominated U.S. "security" planning over the past 40 years. Preparation for space warfare has become one of the top "national security" priorities of this administration. The development of antisatellite [ASAT] weapons and the strategic defense initiative [SDI] are the means to that end. Yet, the putative benefits of such developments are likely to be just as evanescent as have been the avowed benefits of so many weapons programs paid for by the American public in the past. As explained in my February 26 special order address, preparing for space warfare will simply bring greater and greater insecurity, at higher and higher costs.

Our space program could take a different path, however. It could forge a path that truly did enhance our security, and also provided security dividends for people living far beyond our Nation's borders. Such a path is what I would like to explore today.

In my view, there are three distinct and necessary areas of space activity that should be pursued to enhance global security. One would be aimed at global peacekeeping, through the development of an international satellite-based arms control verification and crisis management system. A second would be aimed at global re-



source analysis and management, through the creation of an array of space observatories designed to monitor environmental change on the planet and study the Earth as a unified system. And a third would be aimed at breaking new ground in the United States-Soviet relationship through international cooperative efforts in space of an unprecedented nature, including a manned mission to the planet Mars.

Let me elaborate on these three proposals, starting with the use of space activities for peacekeeping purposes.

The role of space technologies in contributing to enhanced security arrangements has been clear since the first nuclear detection satellite was placed in orbit by the United States on October 17, 1963. Seven days later, the United States signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union and Britain, with the knowledge that it had just launched into space the means of ensuring compliance with the treaty. This development, in many ways, was foreshadowed by President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal made nearly a decade earlier.

It was in 1955 that Eisenhower, speaking at a Geneva Disarmament Convention, proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union allow aerial photography of each other's nation so as to help reduce the possibility of nuclear war stemming from either miscalculation or misguided fears about the other's military capabilities. Eisenhower offered use of the U-2 reconnaissance plane as a means of helping create the record of this information, but Soviet Premier Khrushchev rejected the proposal as a disguised plan to spy on the Soviet Union.

Overtime, however, both nations mounted extensive satellite photoreconnaissance systems that lead, de facto, to a partial realization of Eisenhower's "open skies" initiative. While Eisenhower had proposed that the United Nations be the coordinating agency for the analysis of information about each other's military capabilities and facilities, both nations instead developed agencies of their own to conduct such activities.

Over the past 25 years, photoreconnaissance from space has advanced to an incredible degree. The first spy satellites were not very precise, failing to meet the quality of images taken from the U-2 spy plane. Indeed, it took a number of years and numerous satellites to reach the capability of the U-2 overflights of the Soviet Union, which stopped in 1960 with the shooting down of Gary Powers.

The KH [Keyhole]-8 satellite, first launched in August 1966, reportedly had a resolution of 6 inches, sufficient to detect objects as small as a paperback book from 145 miles in space. With this capability in place, Presi-

dent Johnson in 1966 approached Soviet officials about negotiating limits on strategic nuclear weapons. The SALT I talks began 2 years later. By the time those talks concluded in 1972, the United States had launched its KH-9 satellite, which added further capabilities for monitoring compliance with the SALT I and Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaties.

In contrast to the KH-8 satellite, designed to provide imagery at very high resolutions, the KH-9, also called Big Bird, was designed for taking area surveillance images of larger areas with a resolution measured in feet, not inches. In 1976, the United States launched the KH-11 satellite, which combined both close-look and area surveillance on a single satellite, and also introduced digital imagery technology—an entirely new method of photoreconnaissance and interpretation. Rather than involving the ejection of film canisters by the satellite, and their subsequent capture in the atmosphere by aircraft, the KH-11 collects images electronically and transmits them directly to the ground via a communications relay satellite. And it does this in near real time, providing images of events virtually while they occur. The KH-11 technology represented a revolutionary advance in photoreconnaissance from space.

The newest addition to the U.S. spy satellite inventory will be the KH-12, which some say will render even the KH-11 obsolete. According to press accounts, the KH-12, scheduled for one of the first space shuttle launches in 1988, will have a resolution of less than 4 inches. This might be sufficient to determine whether a person sitting in Red Square was reading the newspaper Pravda or Izvestia. The KH-12 will also be able to see in the dark using thermal infrared sensors.

Future photoreconnaissance satellites will possess even better capabilities. For instance, sensors are being developed that would collect simultaneous images in as many as 200 or more contiguous spectral bands along the electromagnetic spectrum. A multispectral scanner of this form, enormously more sophisticated than any in use today, would represent an incredible breakthrough in the identification and characterization of Earth objects from space, since every substance has slightly different radiation characteristics.

Applications for such sensors will be enormous. For example, sensors of this sort might enable determinations of the precise metals—whether titanium, aluminum, or steel—out of which Soviet weapons are built. Such information would provide insight into the performance of those weapons. The sensors might also enable the characterization of gaseous emissions from Soviet factories to determine whether

they are involved in chemical weapons production.

Also under development for future reconnaissance satellites are radar sensors that could take images at night and through cloud cover. Radar imaging satellites will also be able to provide subsurface information, since radar transmissions can penetrate a certain distance into soils and water. And while these and other advances in sensor development are underway, great breakthroughs in computer enhancement and manipulation techniques can be expected, which will enable the extraction of even more information from collected images.

What I have provided here is simply a cursory look at the evolving capabilities of some of the Nation's photoreconnaissance satellite systems, based on accounts taken from books available to the public, the New York Times and magazines such as IEEE Spectrum. The full details of these satellites remain highly classified. Indeed, even of the office that designs, builds, and operates these satellites is officially classified, although anyone can read about the National Reconnaissance Office [NRO] in various unclassified articles, reports and books.

One can also read about Soviet photoreconnaissance satellites in unclassified literature. What becomes apparent from reviewing both the United States and Soviet spy satellite networks is that these highly secret spacecraft have had a major stabilizing effect on the superpower relationship. They have helped reduce surprises and eliminate exaggerated, worst-case fears. They have made arms control agreements possible and have created a situation where surprise attacks resulting from the mobilization of conventional forces would be impossible. In sum, these satellites have helped keep the peace between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Satellites such as these could help keep the peace between many more nations if they were not under the exclusive control of the United States and the Soviet Union. Indeed, it is this realization that gave rise to initial proposals in the late 1970's for an International Satellite Monitoring Agency, which would carry the existing bipolar, United States-Soviet open skies arrangement to its next logical step, an era of global open skies.

In 1978, the French Government proposed the creation of an international system of surveillance satellites to monitor arms control agreements and help safeguard against military crises. The proposal was quickly rejected by both the United States and the Soviet Union, with United States officials claiming such a system would be unworkable and too costly. But that rejection made at a time when the superpowers maintained a clear

monopoly on high-resolution remote sensing satellites, and that monopoly no longer exists.

In February 1986, the French launched their SPOT satellite, with a 10-meter resolution, and they have plans for four more civilian remote sensing satellites. The Japanese, Canadians, Indians, and the European Space Agency also are in the process of developing earth observation satellites. The news media has a growing interest in high resolution photos from space as well, and may launch a remote sensing satellite of their own in the not too distant future. What this means is that, just as Soviet opposition to Eisenhower's open skies proposal was overcome by the passage of time so too will the superpowers' rejection of an international open skies era be overtaken by events.

An international satellite-based verification system is, *de facto*, coming into being. Within a decade, most of the pieces for such a system will be in place. A multinational array of satellites capable of providing high resolution images will be in orbit within the next 10 to 15 years. Ground receiving stations for these satellites will be located around the globe. The technology for image processing will also be widely available. The only missing element will be the organizational framework for utilizing the information for peacekeeping purposes, and this is where the United States should assume a leadership role.

The United States should recognize that the era of United States-Soviet control over remote sensing from space has ended. Moreover, it should realize that this is a constructive development in terms of global security. A global information network, providing near real time high resolution images of the entire planet to anyone interested in such information, could help create the foundation for new ways of preventing conflict. It could help preclude wars brought on by misunderstanding or miscalculation. The information gathered by such a system could provide the basis for monitoring border disputes, cease-fire agreements, peacekeeping arrangements, and demilitarized zones. It could provide the conditions for new international legal protections for the security of all nations. Quite simply, it would enhance the world's common security.

To help facilitate a global peacekeeping system such as this, a number of actions by the United States are necessary. The United States should stop pretending that its system for taking high resolution images from space is something that nobody knows about; and instead, become an aggressive international promoter of remote sensing as a means of helping enhance global security and international sta-

bility. It could do this in a variety of ways.

First, by relaxing existing regulations on the allowable resolution levels for civilian-launched remote sensing satellites. This limit, presently at 10 meters, will be bypassed anyway by other countries in the near future. Second, by initiating discussions within the Government and with other nations on how best to set up an international agency responsible for verifying arms control agreements and managing military conflicts. And third, by lowering the veil of secrecy that has been draped for far too long over the National Reconnaissance Office and its operations.

The original circumstances that lead to establishing such a tight security blanket around our space photoreconnaissance systems are simply no longer valid. A transparency revolution has been well underway for years, making objects and actions on the face of the Earth increasingly observable to anyone interested. Yet, those in control of the Nation's space reconnaissance program seem eternally locked into an ancient era, an era when the public couldn't go to their corner bookstores or local libraries to pick up a dozen books with information about photoreconnaissance and the NRO. The stealth and secrecy attached to their efforts has reached almost comical proportions.

For more than 20 years, it has been widely known that the United States operates reconnaissance satellites. Yet, it wasn't until 1978 when President Carter made the first public admission of this fact. Today, more than a decade after the first flight of the KH-11, United States officials still refuse to acknowledge the existence of the satellite, even though since 1977 the Soviet Union has owned a KH-11 operator's manual—complete with information about the satellite's characteristics, capabilities and limitations. The manual was purchased for \$3,000 from a former CIA officer.

The NRO has filled warehouses with images of the planet from space, yet access to these images is tightly constrained to only those intelligence officers with a "need to know." Yet, this "need to know" restriction is artificially constraining access to what, to a considerable degree, should be a public resource. The American public has as much "need to know" about military, economic and agricultural developments around the world—as revealed in high resolution remote sensing images—as does anyone within the intelligence communities. Not only do they have a "need to know," they have a right to know. They are the ones who have spent tens of billions of dollars on this information-gathering system.

The American public should be allowed to learn of the powerful peace-

keeping activities of the NRO. They should have the opportunity to incorporate into their understanding of the world real images of the Soviet Union, in the place of the speculative conceptions presently governing the public's view of that country and its people. The images archived by the NRO also would have substantial economic and historical value if made available to the public and to industry for analysis. Those images are loaded with information of commercial value. And while all the details of the NRO's activities—and everything with their archives—certainly need not be revealed, wider knowledge of them would help rebuild support for the arms control process and help lead to an international appreciation for the peacekeeping contributions of remote sensing satellites.

One can be sure that those who have helped maintain secrecy and control over intelligence gathering satellites during the past two decades—both in the United States and the Soviet Union—will be reluctant to forfeit that control now. A clear demonstration of that reluctance was recently seen when the Pentagon voiced strong objections to proposed regulations that would increase the media's access to remotely sensed data. But it should be emphasized once again that the monopoly which once existed over these technologies, exists no more.

Stansfield Turner, former Director of the CIA, predicts that, "it will not be long before we reach the point where all satellite photography will be so good that the differences between various models—from different countries \* \* \* will be insignificant." Turner, who participated in the United States decision to reject the 1978 French open skies proposal, now feels the decision was a mistake. He thinks the United States should move promptly to help establish such a system.

So, too, does another former high-ranking CIA official, Ray Cline, who has written recently that an international satellite monitoring system would be highly beneficial for United States and global security, as well as for helping provide information for the economic advancement of the developing world.

As time goes on, the case for an international network of peacekeeping satellites will only get stronger. Technical, political and market forces are all pushing in the direction of opening up the remote sensing field. Faced with these conditions, it is in the best interests of the United States—a Nation premised on the free flow of information—to step forward now and provide leadership in creating a global "open skies" system. A 1981 United Nations study of the French proposal estimated the cost to be \$2.5 billion (1980 dollars) over a 10-year period for



the launch and operation of a three-satellite system. While this might seem expensive, it would represent a drop in the bucket compared to what the two superpowers already spend on intelligence-gathering satellites in the name of national security. A modest evolution from this system would give the capability for essentially continuous coverage of every spot on the face of the globe.

Let me now turn from the topic of peacekeeping from space, to the topic of environmental management from space.

As I mentioned earlier, the world's communal destiny is not simply threatened by the potential outbreak of nuclear war, it is also threatened by the possibility of environmental crises of global and dimensions.

As the world's population has pressed beyond 5 billion, on its way to 6 billion by the year 2000, there are growing indications that human activities are creating major and potentially hazardous changes on the Earth, oceans and atmosphere. These changes could reach catastrophic proportions within the next century. Evidence of such change can be seen in all directions.

For example, we already know that acid rain caused by the combustion of fossil fuels in automobiles and power plants is having a devastating impact on the forests of central Europe. Studies have shown that more than one-third of the trees of West Germany have suffered damage from airborne pollutants. According to some scientists, vast regions of European forestland will become wasteland within the next few decades as a result of these pollutants.

Fossil fuel combustion also is releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere on a scale likely to cause dramatic shifts in the Earth's climate. Measurements taken over the past few decades have shown a steady, annual increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. If this trend continues, some scientists predict a warming of the Earth by 3 degrees to 8 degrees Fahrenheit over the next 50 years. This could lead to a melting of the polar ice caps and the subsequent flooding of coastal regions around the globe.

Recent studies of the upper atmosphere over Antarctica indicate that the Earth's ozone layer is being depleted on a seasonal basis. Whether this is the consequence of using fluorocarbons in the atmosphere, as many scientists have predicted, is not known.

Nor is it known whether population pressures in Africa—which have led to the desertification of vast regions—may be having a direct, and adverse impact on the climatic conditions of that continent, although theories support this view. While a link between population growth and climate change has been discounted by scientists in

the past, a recent study of the question lead a Canadian meteorologist, Kenneth Hare, to conclude: "We seem to have arrived at a critical moment in the history of mankind's relation to climate. For the first time we may be on the threshold of man-induced climate change." If this is true, the impacts could be momentous, affecting the Earth's ecosystems in a fashion that we simply cannot presently predict.

Our inability to forecast the implications of human-induced global change stems from our vast ignorance of how in fact we are disturbing our surroundings. Yet, knowledge about such issues could be absolutely vital for our security and our survival in the 21st century. Increasingly, this fact is being recognized by scientists throughout the United States and the world, scientists who are now calling for an international study of the Earth through the use of a network of permanent satellite observatories in space, as well as through ground-based instrumentation around the globe. Satellites provide a unique ability to study and monitor the Earth as never before.

Scientists at the National Science Foundation, National Academy of Sciences, and NASA have endorsed a study of the Earth from space, a study which goes by a variety of names, including the International Geosphere-Biosphere Program, Global Change, and Global Geosciences. A report issued recently by the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences refers to such a study as a mission to planet Earth, and outlines the project as including five to six platforms in geostationary orbit and two in low-Earth polar orbits for continuous observations of the entire Earth.

Through the use of space-based sensors of a variety of kinds, scientists could conduct a simultaneous study of the Earth's climate, the oceans, the biosphere, the dynamics of the continents, and the geochemical cycles of all the major nutrients—in short, a study of the entire planet as an integrated whole. Such a study would require cooperation among scientists from every part of the world, and would no doubt be one of the largest cooperative endeavors in the history of science. The benefits from such an effort could be enormous. As stated in one NASA document endorsing the global change research effort, "If pursued with resolve and commitment, this research program will bring us rewards of knowledge as dramatic, and as relevant to humankind, as any in scientific history."

Such a prediction seems entirely warranted. The information emerging from such a study would enable the world's decisionmakers to get a solid grasp on how humans are disturbing their life-support system: planet Earth. Such information might enable us to

predict with confidence environmental problems in advance, allowing the formulation of policies to head off or blunt impending catastrophes. A project that provided such opportunities would, without question, be a security-enhancing endeavor for the entire world. It would provide security against threats that are certain to loom larger and larger in the future unless we act soon to confront them in an international, multidisciplinary and large-scale fashion. Now is the time to start such a study, while we still have time to respond.

The building blocks for a global change project are certainly available. NASA has operated Earth observing satellites since the early 1960's. An international network of weather monitoring satellites are in place. A joint United States-French ocean observation satellite will be launched in 1990, and other ocean observation spacecraft will soon be operated by the Japanese and the European Space Agency. Satellites that measure the Earth's radiation budget and the dynamics of the upper atmosphere will also be flying soon. And there are other satellites under development that will provide data essential for modeling interactions among all the Earth's many components. As these programs progress, sophisticated computer systems and software will be needed to assimilate the data. International agreements will be required in order to manage the flow of information and the interaction of scientists. And a substantial investment will be needed in order to launch and operate the sort of Earth observation platforms that will be critical to the success of the program over an extended period.

By the turn of the century, the global change project could involve a large-scale infrastructure in space comprised of multisensor platforms in both low-earth and geostationary orbit. These platforms could house not only the sensors for monitoring environmental characteristics of the planet, they could also contain sensors for the international satellite-based verification system outlined above. The space shuttle could routinely dock with these platforms in order to repair or replace aging sensors, or to mount new, more sophisticated devices. A multinational network of sensors clustered on a number of these space platforms would be the most sensible and cost-effective means of proceeding with Earth observations from space. In order to achieve such a system, U.S. leadership will be invaluable.

The United States should strongly urge the international community to adopt the Global Change Program, and it should match this aggressive stance with substantial funding commitments which, in and of themselves,

make a statement that the United States is eager to work with nations around the world in developing, through the use of space-based sensors, models of environmental change on the planet so as to help avert human-induced environmental catastrophes in the next century.

This leads to the final topic I would like to discuss today, which is the security-enhancing role of a broad and ambitious agenda of international cooperation in space, including high-profile United States-Soviet space cooperation.

International cooperation in the planning and execution of activities in space is certainly nothing new. Over the past 30 years, the United States has signed more than 1,000 agreements with more than 100 countries for international space activities. These cooperative efforts have ranged from sharing data from space experiments, to the cooperative development of satellites, to the hooking-up of manned spacecraft in orbit, as occurred in 1975 with the Apollo-Soyuz handshake in space involving American astronauts and Soviet cosmonauts.

Cooperative space projects such as these, however, hardly compare to the ones that will be available in the future. This is because a number of developments are working together to create opportunities for space cooperation on a much broader and more ambitious scale than ever before.

The most obvious of these developments is the rapid maturity of space programs around the world. Whereas 30 years ago the United States and the Soviet Union were the only major players in space, today impressive space programs are taking form worldwide. For example, China, India, Japan and the European Space Agency have all developed the ability to launch satellites. Canada, France and West Germany have developed substantial aerospace industries. England is forming its own space agency. Brazil is developing its own remote-sensing satellite. All told, more than 125 nations are involved in space exploration in some fashion. As the number and sophistication of these space programs has increased, cross-fertilization among them has also grown. This development will only accelerate as the world's many space programs set ever-more ambitious goals.

A second factor contributing to greater space cooperation is the increased cost of major space projects. Advances in space technology have led to the development of increasingly complex space systems, which are heavier, have higher power requirements, and produce data at enormous rates. These factors all contribute to growing costs. By sharing the costs of such projects, each participating nation carries a smaller economic

burden while maintaining access to the data of interest. For example, the U.S. space station, spacelab, Hubble Space Telescope, and Infrared Astronomy Satellite have all involved international cooperation in terms of funding, planning and hardware development. Last year's mission to Halley's Comet, involving collaboration between the Soviet Union, United States, European Space Agency and Japan was a prime example of cost sharing in an endeavor that might have seemed prohibitively expensive if pursued by any single nation alone.

A third major development in international space cooperation has been growing openness in the Soviet space program. Up until very recently, the entire Soviet space program was shrouded in extreme secrecy, which made space cooperation with the Soviets enormously difficult. However, the policy of "glasnost," or openness, which is being pursued throughout Soviet society under the leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev, has extended to the space program as well. Last summer, the Soviet Union established for the first time a separate agency for the operation of civilian space activities. Previously, civilian and military space programs were tightly covered by the same security veil. With this new agency—called Glavcosmos—in place, the Soviet Union is assuming an aggressive stance in promoting its civilian space program, seeking customers for its space launch vehicles, partners for space science missions, and passengers for its space station. And given the ambitious space plans of the Soviet Union, space scientists around the world have become increasingly interested in working with the Soviets.

Finally, the advance of technology is increasing opportunities for space cooperation. Developments around the world in areas such as space propulsion, power sources, advanced materials, artificial intelligence and robotics are leading to a future in which space travel will become routine, and space science and exploration will advance beyond many of our wildest dreams. As stated in "Pioneering the Space Frontier," the May 1986 report to the President from the National Commission on Space, "space technology has freed humankind to move outward from Earth as a species destined to expand to other worlds." As this expansion into the solar system occurs, people from around the globe will be interested in participating, and will be technically capable of doing so.

With these developments all underway, it should be incumbent of the United States, as the world's most advanced space-faring Nation, to help lead the world in the development of an agenda for international space activities to take us into the 21st century. Two of the top items on that agenda should be the two I have al-

ready explored, an international satellite-based verification system and the global change program. A third priority should be an ambitious effort aimed at the exploration of Mars.

Over the past year, leading scientists from around the Nation have endorsed a Mars exploration program as a top priority. This summer, the third in a series of "Case for Mars" conferences will be held in Boulder, CO, with sponsorship coming from NASA, the American Astronomical Society and the Planetary Society. At the present time, the Soviet Union is the prime mover in charting out the exploration of Mars, with two unmanned spacecraft scheduled to explore the red planet over the next 6 years. The Soviet Union has proposed a joint United States-Soviet mission to obtain and return sample material from Mars, but NASA, without a similar project underway, has been forced to decline the offer. However, momentum for a United States-Soviet Mars sample return mission is building, as suggested by the recent endorsement of such an effort by Dr. Lew Allen, Director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the Nation's premier laboratory for the unmanned exploration of the solar system.

Exploration of Mars was also the central thrust of a new United States-Soviet Union space cooperation agreement negotiated in October 1986, and awaiting enactment at a superpower summit. Out of 16 agreed cooperative projects that comprise the new agreement, the first 4 in the list involve coordination of United States and Soviet Mars missions. These developments are all leading in the direction of an eventual joint United States-Soviet manned mission to Mars.

A manned Mars mission is certainly feasible, according to the National Commission on Space. Indeed, some scientists say that the technical basis for a manned Mars trip is stronger than was the technical basis for President John F. Kennedy's 1961 decision to land a man on the Moon.

Not only is it feasible, a manned trip to Mars seems highly probable. The Soviets have announced their interest in such a trip. Their long-duration space flights and development of a massive launch vehicle are important components of such a plan. American scientists have shown a similar interest in a journey to Mars, which stands out as the most alluring next challenge for manned space flight. Perhaps the most important question is whether such a venture will be done in cooperation or competition between the superpowers.

Realistically, a manned trip to Mars only makes sense if done in a cooperative fashion involving not only the United States and the Soviet Union, but also countries around the world.



An international manned Mars effort—led by the two superpowers—would be the most challenging and exciting space mission ever pursued.

The cost of a manned trip to Mars has been estimated at \$40 billion, a price that, if shared by a number of nations, would cost the United States much less than was spent to go to the Moon.

And while some observers would question the value of such an expenditure, in my view, the benefits are compelling. Such a project would put some badly needed direction back into the U.S. Space Program. It would do this by giving high priority to a series of increasingly demanding projects that would serve as the technological stepping stones toward Mars. Moreover, such a mission could help lead to a fundamental reshaping of superpower relations.

Recall, if you will, the moment when *Apollo 11* landed on the Moon in 1969. Nearly everyone on the planet within range of a television was watching. Imagine how much more symbolic it would have been if it had not resulted from a lengthy United States-Soviet space race, but rather if it had been the crowning accomplishment of a collaborative effort involving some of the best scientific and engineering minds in the world. A manned trip to Mars could be just such an effort.

And while such a project, in and of itself, could never eliminate the serious and difficult political tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, it could play an enormously valuable role in helping the superpowers see their relationship in new terms. It could do this by helping demonstrate the unassailable, yet constantly ignored fact, that the superpowers have no choice but to coexist on spaceship Earth.

The President of the United States should announce that a manned mission to Mars is a fundamental priority for our space program, and that such a mission will be pursued in collaboration with as many nations as are interested. The formal inauguration of such a project could be made in 1992, which has been designated as the international space year. At the time of launching the effort, the United States could initiate work on a Mars sample return mission to be matched with a companion Soviet effort. By 1992, the Soviet Union will have sent two additional spacecraft to Mars, and the United States will have launched its Mars Observer. These developments would provide the foundation for marshaling the energies, resources and advanced technologies of many nations in a peaceful enterprise in space of an unprecedented scale. The international space year could not be celebrated in a more triumphant manner.

Mr. Speaker, this essentially concludes my discussion today. What I have tried to do is identify three areas of space activity that, in combination, could serve as an alternative to spending a larger and larger share of our space budget on developing space-based and space-directed weapons. The administration's strategic defense initiative and antisatellite weapons programs are justified in terms of national security, but, as I have argued here and elsewhere, such weapons, once deployed by both superpowers, would simply bring new insecurities, and at a cost far beyond that of the projects I have proposed. What I have outlined are space endeavors that seek to break from the antiquated conceptions that now govern our security planning. Those outmoded ways of thinking, characterized by the constant pursuit of weapons as a means toward enhancing security, could well turn space into yet another battleground for the United States-Soviet arms race. We can do better than that.

Space is the common heritage of all the nations of the world. As such, it should be utilized and explored in a manner that adds to the world's common security. As John Foster Dulles once said, "As we reach beyond the planet, we should move as truly united nations." Opportunities for doing so await our attention. The time to focus on them is now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a final note, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a partial bibliography on reconnaissance satellites and the National Reconnaissance Office. Since I mentioned that the material used in my statement was all available from bookstores and libraries, I thought it might be useful to list the titles of those resources.

#### PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON RECONNAISSANCE SATELLITES AND NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

Adams, John et al. "Verification: Peace-keeping by Technical Means," *IEEE Spectrum*, June 1986, pp. 42-80.

Ball, Desmond. *A Suitable Piece of Real Estate: American Installations in Australia*, Sydney, Australia: Hale & Iremonger, 1980.

Bramford, James. *The Puzzle Palace: A Report on NSA, America's Most Secret Agency*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Burrows, William. *Deep Black: Space Espionage and National Security*, New York: Random House, 1986.

Canan, James. *War in Space*, New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Colby, William and Peter Forbath. *Honorable Men: My Life in the CIA*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Freedman, Lawrence. *U.S. Intelligence and the Soviet Strategic Threat*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Lacquer, Walter. *A World of Secrets: The Uses and Limits of Intelligence*, New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Gelb, Leslie. "Keeping an Eye on Russia," *New York Times Magazine*, November 29, 1981, p. 148.

Karas, Thomas. *The New High Ground*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Krass, Alan. *Verification: How Much Is Enough?* Lexington Books, 1985.

Marchetti, Victor and John Marks. *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, New York: Knopf, 1983.

Prados, John. *The Soviet Estimate: U.S. Intelligence Analysis and Russian Military Strength*, New York: Dial, 1982.

Richelson, Jeffrey. *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1985.

Richelson, Jeffrey. "Monitoring the Soviet Military," *Arms Control Today*, October 1986, pp. 14-19.

Richelson, Jeffrey and Desmond Ball. *The Ties That Bind: Intelligence Cooperation Between the UK-USA Countries*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1985.

Smith, Jeffrey. "High-Tech Vigilance," *Science* 85, December 1985, 26-33.

Stearn, Lawrence. "\$1.5 Billion Secret in Sky," *Washington Post*, December 9, 1973, pp. 1, 9.

Taubman, Philip. "Secrecy of U.S. Reconnaissance Office Is Challenged," *New York Times*, March 1, 1981, p. 12.

Tsipsis, Kosta and David Hafemeister. *Arms Control Verification: The Technologies That Make It Possible*, Elmsford, NY: Pergamon, 1985.

Yost, Graham. *Spy-Tech*, New York: Facts on File, 1985.

□ 1850

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent earlier today when the House considered overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Act. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of passage notwithstanding the President's objections.

#### STEPS TAKEN TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL REVIEW BOARD CHAIRED BY FORMER SENATOR JOHN TOWER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 100-58)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ERDREICH) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, March 31, 1987.)

# SUBMISSION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE FOR THE 100TH CONGRESS

(Mr. ST GERMAIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a), the rules of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for the 100th Congress were printed in the RECORD on February 5, 1987. The following is an amendment to those rules:

In rule 15, at the end of the description of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, add the following:

The Subcommittee shall not schedule a hearing on any commemorative medal legislation unless the legislation is cosponsored by at least 218 Members of the House.

In considering legislation authorizing Congressional gold medals, the Subcommittee shall apply the following standards:

(1) The recipient shall be a natural person;

(2) The recipient shall have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement;

(3) The recipient shall not have received a medal previously for the same or substantially the same achievement;

(4) The recipient shall be living or, if deceased, shall have been deceased for not less than 5 years and not more than 25 years; and

(5) The achievements were performed in the recipient's field of endeavor, and represent either a lifetime of continuous superior achievements or a single achievement so significant that the recipient is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANNUNZIO (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), through April 30, on account of illness.

Mr. DANIEL (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GALLO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROGERS, for 60 minutes, on April 7.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. McCANDLESS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. McCANDLESS, for 60 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. McCANDLESS, for 60 minutes, on April 2.

Mr. ROTH, for 60 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. ROTH, for 60 minutes, on April 2.

Mr. ROTH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MOLINARI, for 60 minutes, on April 1.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on April 7.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 30 minutes, on April 2.

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MOLINARI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAW, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERDREICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LaFALCE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ESPY, for 15 minutes, on April 2.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEWIS of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GALLO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. DORNAN of California in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HENRY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. BLAZ.

Mr. TAUE.

Mr. DAUB in three instances.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. WORTLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERDREICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. FLORIO in three instances.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Ms. OKAR.

Mr. DARDEN in two instances.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. LANTOS in three instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. MRAZEK in two instances.

Mr. ERDREICH.

Mr. TAUZIN.

Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. ROBINO in two instances.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 1, 1987, at 2 p.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1041. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Navy's determination and findings on a proposed Government-to-Government agreement with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for product support of the Pegasus engine installed in the AV-8 series of aircraft, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2313(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1042. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 7-13, "Citizens Energy Advisory Committee Extension Amendment Temporary Act of 1987," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1043. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 7-12, "Inheritance and Estate Tax Revision Act of 1986 Amended Temporary Act of 1987," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1044. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting notification that the President intends to exercise his authority under section 506(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act in order to authorize the furnishing of \$10 million in emergency military assistance to Chad, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3871; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1045. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notice of a proposal to amend the HUD/DEPT-2 accounting records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1046. A letter from the Commissioner of Examinations, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting a copy of the order granting defector status in the case of Elisabeth Bruyant Almog, pursuant to 8



U.S.C. 1182(a)(28)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1047. A letter from the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Board's 53d annual report on the activities of TVA during the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1985, and ending September 30, 1986, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 831h(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1048. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 1987 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 100-56); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1049. A letter from the Board of Trustees, the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 1987 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 100-55); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1050. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority to accept contributions toward cooperative work relating to the National Forest System; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

1051. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the 12th annual report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation covering fiscal year 1986, which includes the Corporation's financial statements as of September 30, 1986, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

1052. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 27, 1955, to increase the effectiveness of domestic firefighting forces and ensure prompt and effective control of wildfires on Federal lands by permitting the use of firefighting forces of foreign nations and the reimbursement of such forces for costs incurred in fighting wildfires throughout the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Government Operations.

1053. A letter from the Director (Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management), Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the proposal for the construction of a monitored retrievable storage facility, including an evaluation of the need for and feasibility of MRS in a fully integrated system for the disposal of high level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, pursuant to Public Law 97-425, section 220; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

1054. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 1987 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 100-57); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 135. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1320, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. 100-35). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1865. A bill to amend section 2(11) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DeFAZIO (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TALLON, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1866. A bill to make available to consumers certain information on the performance records of air carriers operating in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 1867. A bill to create criminal penalties for the premature release or use for private gain of sensitive economic indicators generated by the Department of Commerce and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to promulgate regulations deemed necessary to protect such sensitive information prior to public release; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to restore the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the provisions of the Clayton Act relating to the merger of air carriers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 1869. A bill to authorize the granting of diplomatic and consular privileges and immunities to offices of the Commission of the European Communities which are established in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 1870. A bill to provide for the designation of chili as the official food of the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act to extend the programs established in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 1872. A bill to change the title of employees designated by the Librarian of Congress for police duty, to make the rank structure and pay for such employees the same as the rank structure and pay for the

Capitol Police, and to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make such employees eligible for public safety officers' death benefits; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reserve 25 percent of obligations under military construction contracts for local contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to reserve 25 percent of obligations under certain Federal construction contracts for local contractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1875. A bill to establish and expand Federal foreign language and international education programs designed to strengthen the competitiveness of American industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 regarding Federal activities that are subject to the Federal consistency provisions of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1877. A bill to improve the safety of imported meat and poultry products and raw agricultural products subject to pesticides; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 1878. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide procedures for the imposition of the death penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1879. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Tariff Act of 1930 to promote fair trade based on a fair wage; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut

(for himself, Mr. WORTLEY and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 1880. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to establish and implement programs designed to afford greater opportunities for AFDC recipients to achieve self-sufficiency through employment; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. HUBBARD):

H.R. 1881. A bill to clarify the meaning of the phrase "program or activity" as applied to educational institutions that are extended Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Veterans' Job Training Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms.

SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FISH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mrs. BOXER):

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide for enforcement of the rights of patients in long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Maricopa County, AZ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SHARP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. WISE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. BOSCO):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for fair marketing practices for certain encrypted satellite communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve safety on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways by transferring rearward, to other internal axle groups, a part of the load weight carried on the steering axle of a three axle truck-tractor and triaxle semitrailer; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1887. A bill to promote and improve the carrying out of research regarding the commercial fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DE LUGO (for himself, Mr. SUNTA, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS,

Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.J. Res. 217. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of President and Vice President by the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution entitled: "Self-Determination for Puerto Rico"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.J. Res. 219. Joint resolution designating 1987 as "National Year of Shelter for the Homeless"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BORKSI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate October 28, 1987, as "National Immigrants Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for

the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990; to the Committee on the Budget.

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990; to the Committee on the Budget.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

17. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, relative to a proposed amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 25: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 36: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 39: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 52: Mr. BATES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SWINDALL, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 59: Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 74: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 117: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 130: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 157: Mr. CONTE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CRAIG, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. FROST, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 186: Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 245: Mr. GORDON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 275: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 313: Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 372: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 379: Mr. DeWINE and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 432: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 469: Mr. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 514: Mr. MacKAY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. McKINNEY, and Mr. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 537: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 575: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 578: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 592: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. YATRON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. WISE and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 759: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COURTER, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 768: Mr. McKINNEY.

H.R. 789: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 791: Mr. McGRATH.

H.R. 799: Mr. ROEMER and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 900: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. OWENS of Utah.



H.R. 910: Mr. MINETA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. YATES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. McCURDY, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 911: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 924: Mr. FROST, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 980: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 988: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1008: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1025: Mr. GREEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1026: Mr. SUNIA and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1041: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1049: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1050: Mr. SIKORSKI and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1064: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 1065: Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 1072: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1148: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. REGULA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PARRIS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1154: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1180: Mr. ATKINS, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 1202: Mr. GRANDY, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 1203: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1211: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1213: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 1214: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SABO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1228: Mr. GALLO, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 1240: Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SOLOMON and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1259: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 1290: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1397: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1412: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1432: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 1436: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 1443: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1479: Mr. MAVROULES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1483: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1517: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1545: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 1548: Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 1560: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. STARK, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ROE, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1561: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1585: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BATES, and Mr. KONNYU.

H.R. 1624: Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1639: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1641: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1701: Mr. FRANK and Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 1722: Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1723: Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1729: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 1732: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 1742: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1752: Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1776: Mr. CONTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1788: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FRANK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BATES, and Mr. KONNYU.

H.R. 1829: Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1830: Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1845: Mr. CHENEY and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FISH, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KYL, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. McGRATH.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KONNYU, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. KEMP, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LENT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. STARK, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HILER, Mr. BATES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT.

H.J. Res. 116: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HOPKINS.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 132: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. McEWEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr.

DORNAN of California, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FISH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COATS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. LUNGREN.

H.J. Res. 155: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. McMILLAN of Maryland, Mr. OLIN, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.J. Res. 164: Mr. NIELSON of Utah and Mr. ECKART.

H.J. Res. 173: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. GRADISON.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr.

HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHULZE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.J. Res. 193: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 201: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HILER, and Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CARR, Mr. YATES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MacKAY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. INHOPE, and Miss SCHNEIDER.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BEVILL, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. ATKINS.

H. Res. 15: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Res. 68: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. ROBINSON.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1777

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:  
—After section 146, insert the following new section:

SEC. 147. AUTHORITY OF CHIEF OF MISSION.

Section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Nothing in this section authorizes the chief of mission to a foreign country to direct, coordinate, or supervise the activities in that country of representatives of the Inspector General or of the Comptroller General in the conduct of any inspection, investigation, or audit within the jurisdiction of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General. If the Secretary of State finds that the activities of representatives of the Inspector General or of the Comptroller General in a foreign country pose a serious danger to the foreign policy or national security of the United States, the Secretary of State may direct the Inspector General, or request of the Comptroller General, to curtail the activities of their representatives to the extent necessary to protect the foreign policy or national security of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Inspector General' means the Inspector General of the Department of State, as established under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.); and

"(B) the term 'Comptroller General' means the Comptroller General of the United States."